

THE  
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1870.

---

ART. I.—*Minutes of Several Conversations between the Methodist Ministers at their Hundred and Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference, begun in Burslem, on Tuesday, July 29th, 1870.* London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1870.

THIS little volume will be regarded by a large number of our readers with a deeper interest than any similar publication of the year. Its value to them is two-fold: first, as the authoritative record of the ecclesiastical body whose "conversations" it gives in their results; and, secondly, as marking the progress, position, and prospects of the whole community of British Methodism. A few pages of the present number of our Journal may be very appropriately devoted to some reflections to which these *Minutes* give rise.

The Conference of 1870 has presented some features of novelty. It held its sessions in a district not hitherto visited by the annual assembly; and with the effect of proving that in no part of the country has Methodism a firmer hold of the population, and a warmer place in the hearts of its own people, than in North Staffordshire. It has made, also, some experiments on the readjustment of its preliminary committees, and given important indications of a disposition, at no distant time, to consider certain questions bearing on the condensation of its business, the limitation of its number, the shortening of its sittings, the relations of the earlier District Committees, the character and terms of its lay representativeship, and other kindred subjects which it would be premature to discuss at present, however soon they may come before our attention. The Conference has also enlarged the franchise for the election of its chief officers: perhaps as the effect of this change, at any rate concurrently with it, the Presidential chair is filled this year by a minister who has sat in it before; one, it may be observed, whose

distinguished qualities commend the honour done him to the approval of all parties, and will amply vindicate this return to the ancient practice.

To another novelty we must devote a rather more extended notice. The "Fernley Lecture" has been added to the programme of the services connected with the Conference. The object of its founder, the gentleman whose name it bears, is to secure, by a liberal endowment, the annual delivery and publication of a lecture on some prominent doctrine of Christianity: the discourse to be delivered on the evening that intervenes between the mixed committees and the opening of the Conference proper,—at a time, therefore, when it may be presumed that laymen and ministers will be both fairly represented; and to be published in such a manner as to insure a wide separate circulation, and to allow of its being afterwards added to a growing series of volumes. The lecture aims at two objects: first, to be a full and complete, however concise, presentation of the theological bearings of the topics discussed; and, secondly, to exhibit, as far as may be possible within the limits assigned, the application of the doctrine to the needs of the times, and its erroneous tendencies. The project is as enlightened and sagacious as it is generous. Such an annual statement and vindication of truth will probably be studied with eagerness by many intelligent minds, especially among the younger ministers and laymen; and thus a compendious safeguard will be provided for those who might not find leisure or inclination to read larger treatises. At the same time, such a publication will do something, at least, towards promoting the spread of vital truth into circles beyond that from which it issues. We anticipate a future of eminent usefulness for this lectureship; and, meanwhile, in common with most of our readers, anticipate with pleasure the first fruits of this institution in the discourse on the "Office and Work of the Holy Spirit" which, with great acceptance, was delivered at Hanley by the Theological Tutor of Richmond. Its publication will doubtless explain more fully the details of a scheme which is here only sketched in outline.

We cannot pass from this topic without adverting to the spirit of liberality among Methodist laymen, of which this is but one instance. There never was a time when men generally were more disposed to learn the lessons which the Bible teaches as to the true value of riches. The noblest proofs of this have recently been given in England and America. In both countries the devotion of substance, on a



larger scale, to the glory of God and the good of man, has had some of the finest examples known to modern times. Nor is the increase of Christian liberality confined to occasional triumphs of a vast munificence. It is seen in the wide and almost universal diffusion of a spirit of free-giving to the various interests of religion and charity far surpassing the traditions of older days. Such organisations as the "Systematic Benevolence Society" have done much to promote this spirit; but these are themselves only the expression, or the instruments, of a Divine influence moving upon the minds of wealthy men, and teaching them the dignity, blessedness and responsibility of the stewardship of riches. There is nothing more grateful in these annual *Minutes* than the evidences they give that the Methodist people are partaking in the general effusion of the spirit of charity. No year passes without the acknowledgment of some deeds of eminent benevolence, such as the building of places of worship by individual men, or, as in the present year, in the offer of tens of thousands of pounds towards provision for the neglected districts of half-heathen London.\*

Less than this we could not say with the *Minutes* in our hands. But it must not be supposed that no other tone is appropriate than that of gratulation. Much has been done; much is in process of accomplishment; but more remains to be done—more ought to be done—by the enormous resources of the Methodist people than it has yet entered into their minds to project. Enormous these resources are, and constantly increasing, and claims widen and deepen around them on every hand. Immense tracts of a country, that may be said to be the very centre of civilisation and Christianity, are heathen in all but the name. Recent legislation throws tens of thousands of untaught children as their fair proportion—if such a term has any meaning for Christian charity—upon their special care. Never was there such a call for the employment of wealth in the encouragement and diffusion of Christian literature, which might be promoted in Methodism

---

\* This kind of beneficence is industrious in teaching new directions. One has been adverted to above. The founder of the "Lecture" is also one of several gentlemen who have bethought themselves to form endowments for the encouragement of theological and classical scholarship in the three colleges of the Connexion. Nothing can be more well judged and kind than this patronage of worthy young candidates, many of whom have thus the opportunity, in the noblest and most laudable manner, of adding to their scanty libraries. The appeal made to others to copy the example of such benefactors will surely be responded to; and the next annual *Minutes* will probably show that it has been.

as elsewhere in many ways now scarcely thought of. Their own internal economy as a religious communion presents appeals more urgent, and from a wider variety of sources, than their fathers ever knew. And the great outlying world of heathenism enforces its own peculiar, unchanged and everlasting plea. Surely, then, there is no ground for complacency; or, at least, for any but a chastened complacency. We feel a flush of satisfaction when we read the record of what is given, and of what is done; but there is another unwritten record of what might be given and of what might be done by the men of influence, station, and wealth, who are the strength of the Methodist community. It is not our vocation to preach; ours is only a quiet testimony. But that testimony we must bear in the hearing of many laymen who will read these pages. Let them reflect upon the position they now occupy in their religious community; upon the extended, and always extending, sphere of their influence in it; of the great work they, especially their young men, are rising up to carry on and enlarge. Let them determine to take the loftiest view of their vocation, and show the laity of Christian England—in some respects we might say the enfranchised laity of Christian England—an example of what may be done by consecrated intellect, and wealth, and, above all, laborious zeal in the common cause of Christianity and progress.

To return, however, to our purpose, which is to take a glance at the present position of Methodism in England, as one of the ecclesiastical forces of the land, whether viewed as a congregation of Christian churches, or as a great religious society belonging to the universal visible Church of Christ. It might be interesting to pause and ask the preliminary question which of these descriptions best suits the Methodist Connexion. To enter upon such an inquiry at length would lead us away from our present object; and it could issue only in one result. To such a question there can be but one answer: both these descriptions are equally true and equally applicable, and that they are equally true and equally applicable constitutes the formal distinction and peculiarity of the Methodist communion in this country. The several societies of the people called Methodists are, to all intents and purposes, Christian churches, complete in themselves, and wanting nothing, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered. Originally formed as voluntary associations of converts from the world, believers in Christ, and professors of Christian godliness, they retain that character still; having their own views of Christian fel-

lowship, mutual exhortation, and strict communion in the exercises of the Divine life. But the same Spirit who made them a people under these conditions has, in a manner undesired and unexpected by themselves, introduced them into independent ecclesiastical relations; and they have not been at a loss how to accommodate themselves to the change. Retaining their society organisation and their connexional unity, they have taken their place in the broad field of Christendom without fear and without reproach—at least without just reproach. Their society rules and conditions they regard as an admirable and almost perfect expedient for insuring pastoral oversight and Christian discipline; as far as possible, they bring all their flocks under this regimen; and, in due time, left to their own interpretation of the Divine will, and unharassed by agitation, they will secure this object. Meanwhile, they do not make—they never have made—any rules of their society, as such, universally binding upon members of the Christian Church, as such. It is simply an offence to aver that they have ever done so. The Methodist Connexion has never assumed to be synonymous or co-extensive with *the Church* in any place; it is a society in the universal Church, or, as some would prefer to say, a society embedded in its own Church. It does not make admission into the Church participation in its ordinances, or exclusion from its communion dependent upon any act of its own *as a society*. It reverently gives the sacraments the place the Lord has given them. It admits the children whom He commanded to be brought to Him, and trains them up for Him as His. It gives the Eucharistic symbols to all who, tested, are found worthy of this seal upon Christian fellowship. It does not give over to Satan those who can no longer walk with them according to their rules; or silence necessarily as ministers of Christ those who can no longer be fellow-helpers with them. Half-blinded and indiscriminating controversy may torture this question into the semblance of great wrong and great error; but practically, and under the plastic influence and wise guidance of the Holy Spirit, the true Founder of the Methodist community, these several relations work harmoniously to one end. Society and Church agree together here, and in this province, as they have agreed together in every age of Christian history, and in almost every department of Christendom.

True, there may seem to be anomaly. One whose mind is preoccupied and filled with the ideal of the Church's unity will find abundant matter of indictment against such a state

of things. Whether he trace the lineaments of his ideal in the pages of the New Testament or in the theory of pontifical Rome; if it remains an ideal of one corporate, indivisible, all-embracing, and all-excluding visible unity, he will turn with pity or contempt from the notion of a Church that is not *the Church*, of rites, ceremonies, regulations, and ordinances that are not binding upon all men everywhere, and of exclusion from one communion that does not excommunicate from all. But this opens a far wider question than any involved in Methodist usage. Such a challenge is thrown down before all the Evangelical Churches of Christendom. It concerns the whole state of Christ's Church upon earth. We have only to take refuge in the will of the Great Head, testified by a thousand tokens, too plain to be unseen, and too decisive to be misunderstood. He has given in history and in act His mind concerning the relations of the visible and the invisible Church, concerning the intercommunion of Churches in the same territory which may differ in non-essentials while one in the common truth, and concerning the internal arrangement of individual communities. "Distributing severally as He will," is a text that has a modern comment beyond the conception of him who wrote the words. All this may not be according to man's mind, it may not be according to our own, but it is His will, and from that there is no appeal.

There have been lately two tides of agitation setting in strongly upon the peculiarities of Methodism. One has arisen from within, and has been, or soon will be, effectually allayed; the calmness of legislative wisdom will do all that a thoughtful consideration of the needs of changing times may suggest. Another has arisen from without: the honourable and sincere expression of many Christian minds in the Anglican Church, and in almost all parties of that Church, for the removal of the wall of separation built up by nearly a century between two communities which, in regard to this object, may be called mother and daughter. Our views on this point have been already given, and there is no recent proposal definite enough to demand consideration. Absolutely, and in the nature of things, there can be no reason why the union should be impossible; there is too much in common between the two parties to make it hopeless: and the spirit of yearning after union in the common worship and work of Christianity must needs make it to all devout souls a matter greatly to be approved. At any rate such overtures demand to be treated with deep respect. But as things are there is no ground for hope, and but little for desire. It is not our

present purpose to consider this question directly; but it will be touched indirectly by some observations we desire to make on the distinctive position of the Methodist community as having its own appointed and unshared place in relation to the doctrine, and worship, and work of the Christian Church of our land.

There is no religious body in England, perhaps in the world, which holds a more clearly defined system of doctrine, and holds it more tenaciously. That system is not scientifically elaborate; it is not defined in formula or creed; to the apprehension of many it might seem to be no system at all, and to be as loosely held as is consistent with any external standard of objective faith. In many respects this may be true. The creed of Methodism is not formularised into any Articles or Confession. It is the "Faith once delivered to the saints," interpreted in writings which are accepted by this people as its own expression of faith. But there is nothing tremulous or uncertain in the mind of the Connexion as to the body of essential Christian truth. Any deviation is at once detected and dealt with unsparingly. There has never been an instance of the toleration of vital error; and that sensitiveness was never more alert than at the present time, when, we say it with sorrow, the general tendency of religious communions is to put as free and accommodating a construction as possible upon their formularies. In nothing is the genius of Methodism more opposed to the spirit of the age than in this. The avowed aim of great numbers of the modern representatives of the Reformers is to remove the offence of bondage to the letter of defined doctrine, to put an end to every test of intellectual belief, and to abolish whatever hindrance there may lie in the creed to a universal comprehension of all who, with every shade of opinion concerning Him, accept the name of Jesus; and this tendency infects the conduct of many who would shrink from going this length. It shows itself in their silent indifference to the obligations of the plain statements of the Confessions to which they are pledged. They have learned to avoid reflecting too curiously or too anxiously upon the definitions they once accepted of such doctrines as Inspiration, Original Sin, Atonement, Election, Eternal Punishment. It is not uncharitable to assert that such a tendency to relax and qualify the stringency of objective faith is everywhere spreading. But there is no sign apparent of any complicity in this evil among the community of which the Conference is the head.

The maintenance of this rigorous adhesion to their ancient

type of doctrine on the part of the Methodist body appears to us a matter of much importance, whether we consider the value of that doctrine itself as containing the essential truth found in all confessions, or the value of its faithful assertion as a protest against the errors that are abounding more and more around us.

Methodist doctrine can make good its claim to be the Catholic faith of the Christian Church, as transmitted faithfully from the beginning through and in spite of a vast mass of additions and corruptions. It has originated no dogma: it has nothing that it did not receive. It has added nothing; it has lost nothing: bold words, but words that may be fearlessly spoken. It retains the Holy Scriptures, in their integrity and full authority; it holds the ancient creeds; and it has its clear apprehension of each doctrine of the whole round of systematic theology. It has brought into fuller prominence certain vital truths that were, not indeed forgotten, but suffered to sink into undue abeyance. It asserts no doctrine, and no interpretation of Scripture, for which it cannot appeal to the sanction of the Scripture itself, and the consent of communities, and individual saints too eminent to be despised. But, while making no pretension to a better system of faith than Christendom has ever known, it has a quiet assurance of retaining the good and rejecting the evil of many ecclesiastical confessions. It has held fast the best part of the teaching of the Anglican theology; and better represents some of its schools than Anglicanism itself. It holds its doctrine of the sacraments, without its exaggerated sacramental theory. It keeps the purest essence of its Platonic divinity; its Christian perfection without its mysticism. It has the stamp of Anglican Arminianism, as impressed by some of the greatest divines of the English Church, without the latitudinarianism into which that has since degenerated. It has the unction, and tenderness, and glow of Puritan theology, without its Calvinism: the doctrines of grace without the decrees and without the restriction that tolerates indwelling sin. Its emphatic testimony concerning the witnessing Spirit gives it the real presence of Christ in His Church, and in the heart of the believer; without the perversions of the doctrine exhibited in Romanism, at the one extreme, and Quakerism at the other, of fundamental error. Thus comprehensive, without being eclectic, the Christian Faith of Methodism may well be the object of jealous guardianship to those into whose keeping it is committed.



The importance to the cause of Christianity of the rigid protest of Methodism against error cannot be over-estimated. As a rampart against heresy, and a champion of the truth, it may be said, without ostentation, that this system has a universal importance: as in England, so in America, and to some extent throughout the Christian world. But we must limit ourselves to our own country. Who that watches the currents of opinion, and the course of legislation, and the Christian literature that is so prolific, but must perceive that heresy, open or disguised, honest or dishonest, is growing bolder every year, and assuming a greater variety of forms? Who can doubt that it is sanctioned in its boldness, and stereotyped in its forms, by public authority, evermore becoming more tolerant and lax? Scarcely one of the Thirty-nine Articles, that is not the object of a private interpretation which defies its plain meaning, and which, nevertheless, propagates itself in English pulpits without fear of challenge. The religious teachers of England are at this moment teaching for doctrine, and without much fear of being silenced, almost every shade of error from pure Roman Catholicism to Scriptureless Rationalism; and some of them, as we know by our own observation, strangely combining Ritualistic ceremonial of the highest order with Latitudinarian doctrine of the broadest kind. And these errors, and tendencies of error, are not confined to those who have subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles: the adherents of the Westminster Confession are not guiltless; almost everywhere there are taught doctrines concerning Inspiration, the Sacrifice of Christ, the Future State, which, judged by the public standards of the Churches of England, are errors. These errors, we have said, are increasing: we do not say they are universal. On the contrary, it is our conviction that common fear exaggerates them; and that the Church of England and the Nonconforming churches, are much sounder than indiscriminating journals and platform addresses represent them to be. Nor do we suggest, or insinuate, that on Methodist orthodoxy is, in any sense, laid the stress of the defence of truth in England: all we maintain is, that the general danger is increasing; that the spirit of laxity, and of the suppression of distinctions in creed, is abroad; that the well-known rigour in the maintenance of uniformity in doctrine among the Methodists is an important element in the defence of Christianity in our land; and that this fact imposes upon them, as a people, a very heavy responsibility.

How, then, may they meet that responsibility? What

safeguards have they among themselves? and how may they make those safeguards still more safe? Here is matter for very serious thought. It is not enough to say that they have their standards and their inviolable trust-deeds; their multiplied rigorous examinations of their ministers and candidates for the ministry; their vigilant annual assembly, guarding with jealousy the interpretation of the documents of their faith. All this does, indeed, represent an important provision for defence, and guarantee for fidelity, which has hitherto been found sufficient. The ultimate appeal provided in Methodism has been always really final; and probably always would be so, even were its interpretation of its standards challenged in other courts. But the Methodism of the past has never depended upon these external defences of its purity in doctrine: its fidelity has been largely the result of its pure devotion to the truth, and enthusiasm for its own traditional doctrine and preaching. Were that to languish, soundness in the faith would soon be imperilled. The spirit of error that has defied so many creeds, and found a non-natural sense for so many definitions, and been tolerated in doing so, would be fertile in the same subterfuges when dealing with the Methodist formularies, and would find the same toleration. The purity and vigour of the Connexional defence of the faith must finally depend upon the heartiness and simplicity of its own faith in itself, and in the deposit of truth committed to it. Hence, we regard it as a thing as deeply to be desired that the Methodist people, laymen and ministers, should cherish, even at the expense of being thought bigoted and narrow, their own traditional form of sound doctrine.

This, we are well aware, is directly opposed to the general notion of what the age demands. Some of the wisest, most devout, and most orthodox men are of opinion that the cause of Christianity has been injured by the maintenance of denominational peculiarities, and that it would be a great gain if Christians of all shades of opinion might meet in any place of worship with the certainty of hearing only the broad generalities of the Gospel, and of being unoffended by any sharply-defined peculiarities. For ourselves, we do not share this opinion. Speaking only of the Methodist people, we think that it would be an evil if all that has marked them out from others were effaced. We think that more than enough has already been done in this way; that concession to this notion has gone almost too far; at any rate, there is considerable danger lest it should go too far, and the noble peculiarities of a fine old theology fade into a mere tradition.

To some extent, concession must be made. The Methodists cannot depend wholly upon their own literature as they used to do; and the theological works which they read come from all quarters, and must needs gradually, but surely, efface some distinctive marks. But where there is a thorough enthusiasm for the old doctrines, and the old modes of presenting them, an enthusiasm fed by experience and the memory of what has been wrought by those doctrines, it will be impossible for innovation to make much havoc, at least in anything but the phraseology of faith, and not much even in that. A strong theology, such as this, should assimilate others, not be assimilated; it should mould what it borrows, and not be moulded by it; and in all its dealings with other literature maintain its own supremacy.

This refers, of course, to the studies of ministers. But the same thing may be said of the preaching of those ministers. Nothing would be more to be deplored than the softening away of those features which have distinguished the pulpit of Methodism, the abandonment of that method of presenting and enforcing Christian truth which needs no other definition than "Methodist preaching." Not only as an instrument of conversion and edification is the pulpit important—but as the public instructor in religion and champion of the truth. Here, again, our view differs from that of many. We think that pulpit instruction has very much indeed to do with the faith of the community. Books of exposition, volumes of sermons, reviews, magazines and quasi-religious journals, have not superseded the ancient ordinance for the instruction of men. The preachers are, or might be, if they honoured their vocation, still the main moulders of the national faith. If this be true, the importance of a sound distinctive Methodist preaching is not to be exaggerated. Catholic and true to Christianity, Methodist and true to itself, its work is the same as it ever was, but with a new element in its commission. It used to be a mighty agent for the conversion of sinners, and for kindling a revival of religion throughout the land. It has that mission still, but by no means so distinctively, or, rather, so exclusively as of old; it has now to maintain a clear unfaltering protest in every district, and in every parish, and in every town of England, to the vital truths of the Gospel of salvation. It can never accomplish this so well as in its old style, in the language, so to speak, wherein it was born. Let its young preachers remember the peculiar relation they are called to sustain to the other religious bodies, and the general

religious state of England, and value their own theology and their own hereditary style of preaching it. Let them study Anglican, and German, and French, and American divines: this is a necessity and a privilege. Let them take all the benefit of modern international Christian literature. But let them keep their fidelity to their own mould of doctrine: there is none better. And let them emulate the old style of preaching: there is none so good. Thus we end our testimony as it respects the doctrinal relations of the Methodist community.

The provision for Divine service and worship in the community of Methodism may next claim attention; very brief attention, however, as this is a subject which admits of only very general discussion in such pages as ours. Our remarks must, like those on the Methodist doctrine, be limited to the relation which the Methodist worship—using that term in its widest sense—bears to that of the other communities of the land. Here again the old distinction rises before us: part of its ordinances are such as are observed in common with the Christian Church generally, and part belong to the Society strictly considered as such.

There are two types of Divine public worship which divide our Christendom: the liturgical and the unliturgical, using these terms in their conventional and well-known meaning. Now it is the peculiarity of Methodism that in its theory, and almost universal practice, it unites these two; differing in this respect from the parent Church of England, which makes no provision for the employment of extemporaneous ministerial prayer, and but little for the public exercise of the inalienable function of God's people as a praying priesthood; differing also from the other Nonconformist bodies, which know nothing of liturgical service save as an occasional innovation and irregularity. The sacraments are administered in this body according to the rites, slightly modified, of the Church of England; and this of itself stamps a liturgical character on its ecclesiastical constitution. The morning service of the Lord's Day, in its original Methodist order, comprises the Liturgy in full or abridged, but with no restriction on extempore prayer, the services of the remainder of the day and of the week being left entirely free. It is well known that that original order is not retained in very many of their places of worship, indeed in the great majority; it is equally well known that a strong antipathy to the Common Prayer-Book prevails throughout a considerable portion of the community; and finally, it hardly need be said that the genius of the system, legislative and administrative, requires that perfect

freedom of option be enjoyed in this matter by the builders and worshippers of new houses of prayer. Still, and on the whole, it may be fairly said that the normal Methodist worship, including in that term the sacraments and public prayer, is a combination of prescribed service and free exercise. In no place of worship is the service as a rule and in all respects omitted; and it cannot be denied that the fairest representative of the public morning worship derived from their fathers is found in such Methodist chapels as retain the Liturgy, with its Psalms and Lessons, the Litany, the occasional Communion Service, with its theological Trinitarian Creed, and extempore prayer introducing the Methodist sermon: all this being supposed to be preceded by the early prayer meeting, and to be followed by the freer evening service, with the other abundant exercises and ministries of devotion that fill up the busy day of rest in Methodism.

On many grounds we bear testimony to the great advantage of this peculiarity—for such we repeat it is—of the Methodist system of Divine service, as it has been provided by God and blessed to man for so many years. We are not now referring to the advantage to the worshippers themselves, though much might be said on this point. We might enlarge upon the value of the Liturgy as insuring the dignity, completeness, comprehensiveness, and symmetry of the Divine service; as relieving the minister of a certain part of his heavy responsibility, or at least helping him better to bear it; as providing an effectual safeguard against the irregularities of spontaneous ritualism; as in itself a refreshing, inspiring, and exalting service to those who enter into its design. But it is not our design to plead controversially for the Prayer-Book; it is enough on this subject to hint what may be urged in behalf of an order that already exists, and is accepted by many. It is more in harmony with our object to insist upon the advantage of this order to the mission of Methodism among the Churches of the land. It is the only community that offers a refuge to the multitudes of those who are seeking Gospel truth where they find it not, and who come all the more readily to those services which do not too violently wrench them from their old associations and predilections for the Common Prayer. Doubtless something may be said on the other side. It may be asserted that many are repelled by the Liturgy, and that there are great masses of people to whom Methodism has a mission that have no prejudices in its favour. It may be affirmed, and with some painful truth, that its use in many congregations does not

tend to promote reverence and devotion. But whatever deduction may be made, the fact remains that the Methodist combination of the old service and abundant extempore prayer and meetings for prayer gives the system a peculiar adaptation to the case of what will always be the majority of the careless population of the country; and we cannot but think that if in every great centre of that population provision were made in some chapel or chapels to meet their case, that token of wisdom would be amply justified by the results.

Before leaving this topic we would point the same application as was made in relation to the peculiarities of Methodist doctrine. These are the times of the removing of landmarks, and softening away of all notes of distinction. The finger of a blind and exaggerated charity—which is, despite all its pretences, more akin to latitudinarianism than charity—is too busily effacing every trace of the minor distinctions among Christians. We deprecate the entrance of that spirit into Methodism: so far as it has entered, we would do our humble part to banish and drive it away. Pleading for the old doctrines, and the old manner of preaching them, we plead also for the old usages of worship. Let nothing be done to remove those glorious tokens the removal of which would pave the way for absorption into the Church of England. Let nothing be done to remove those ancient and hereditary forms of worship and feelings of sympathy the removal of which would make Methodism a simple form of Dissent. Advances in either direction add nothing to the dignity, safety, or peace of the body. Let them be steadily discountenanced.

This leads at once to those peculiarities of Methodistic worship which belong to the society or the united societies. Speaking of these, a few words will suffice; we must not add to the offence, already too largely committed, of making them matter of unseemly controversy in public journals. But it is impossible to comment upon the special characteristics of this community without referring to its society organisation, especially the class-meeting. And this institution may be best regarded under two aspects: first, as an interior, voluntary form of Christian fellowship; and, secondly, as the fundamental bond of organisation.

No thoughtful reader of the New Testament can fail to perceive, in its exhibition of early Christianity, distinct traces of that kind of social Christian communion which has its modern expression in what are called class-meetings. The



principle, at least, of this mutual fellowship in the exercises, exhortations, and mutual guardianship, must be evident to those who deny the existence of any such institution. Under a variety of names and regulations, such assemblies have been part of the living Christianity of the Church in its best and purest times; and it is most certain that, in every age, the quickened intensity of religious feeling in the community has instinctively sought this expression. The nature and characteristics of that fellowship it is not for us here to enlarge upon; suffice that its theory meets the purest natural instincts of the human heart in a manner most consistent with the principles of the new life of man in Christ. It was a higher than human suggestion which gave Methodism this corporate form of its religious life. The blessing that has rested upon it has been and still is attested by the experience of countless thousands in all parts of the world. As an institution, which has only given more definite form, and a more systematic importance, to a Scriptural law which has been owned and acted upon in every earnest church from the beginning, the Methodist class-meeting has stood the test of more than a century, and bids fair to thrive to the end of time.

This, however, will depend much upon the Christian wisdom and consistency of the Methodists themselves. This fundamental ordinance of their society-life has been subjected to many a stern ordeal, and it is undergoing one of the severest in the present day. But it has nothing to fear, if those most interested in its prosperity give heed to the signs of the times. The current criticism of which they hear so much should have the effect of stimulating the guides of the Methodist people to study carefully, that they may state clearly the grounds on which they exhort all who hear them to enroll themselves in this weekly fellowship of profession: that so all may understand, in the midst of much confusion, what these meetings are not, and what they are. It is not difficult to state the case in a few words with respect to both sides of this question.

It is not alleged on behalf of this institution that, in its present form and order, it is described and ordained in the New Testament. It is enough that the duty of mutual communion, confession, and exhortation is laid down as a law; and that the methods of complying with that duty are largely left by the Head of the Church to the wisdom and discretion of His people. Some, standing or falling to their own Master, deem the obligation discharged by the general rela-

tions between pastors and people. The Methodists do not hold that opinion. Giving up no one element of the pastoral relation, they think that more than this is wanting. Public instruction is essential, but, in itself and alone, too general; private intercourse with the minister most important, but, in itself, too individual, and for the needs of a great congregation necessarily insufficient. Between these, therefore, they find place for a fellowship uniting both, and inconsistent with neither. It hardly need be said that this ordinance is not placed on a level with the sacraments of Christianity; it has never been imagined that joining this fellowship is equivalent to joining the Christian Church, thus invading the prerogative of faith in Christ, and baptism, its sign and pledge; nor has it ever been declared to be the badge or seal of continued communion with the one Body, thus invading the prerogative of the other sacrament. The adherents of this ordinance would rather place it midway between the two; and make it a continuous confirmation of the faith once professed and sealed in baptism, and a continuous test of fitness for the higher communion and preparation for it. Further, none but the very thoughtless or very ignorant can suppose that this institution is deemed vital or obligatory on everyone who desires to be a true Christian, as if all those who decline it were omitting a positive Christian duty, living out of Christ, or at a distance from Him. The Methodists do not imagine that the common Master looks less kindly upon His other, and it may be better, sheep than He looks upon them. They themselves approach the Lord's table with many of their own communion whose fitness for that sacrament is vouched otherwise than by attendance at their class-meetings. Moreover, they demur to the notion of enforcing as absolutely obligatory what they regard as the privilege of free, spontaneous brotherly fellowship. Desiring that all around them may themselves *feel* the obligation, they are not so bigoted or so blind as to *enforce* it. Finally, attendance on these means of grace is not for a moment to be likened to the visiting of a common confessional. It is enough to repeat that this fellowship is free, spontaneous, and governed by charity, the royal law of liberty. Those who enter in it have but one Confessor, one Master, one fear: silently or aloud, questioned or questioning, speaking or listening, they make their individual and common profession of faith in the presence of Him who, on the memorable occasion when He first spoke of His visible Church, added, *wherever two or three are met in My name there am I in the midst.*

The class-meeting, as the bond of Methodist organisation, presents itself under a somewhat different aspect, and as such must be looked at with a careful, but unprejudiced eye. The question, however, has in it no element of real embarrassment.

Viewed as a religious society, within its own Church, or the Church universal, Methodism has but one condition of membership. It can have but one. It is needless to establish a point which the entire system confesses, through the whole compass of its marvellous organisation. Take away that and the integrity of the body is lost; it ceases by that fact to exist. And to those who regard this community only in that light, there is absolutely no difficulty as to the question of the terms of membership. They may look upon their religious denomination as a distinct branch of the Catholic Church, with its own internal organisation; its membership being perfectly optional, and the way of access and egress at all times open. That this was the unwritten, unavowed theory of the origin of Methodism there can be no doubt. And in its present position, it needs no very fervent enthusiasm to construct an ideal relation to the general Church in which all shall be reduced to harmony. There is the Society, with its portion of the communicants of the great Church, enjoying its own privileges, conforming to the rules of its own order; and, at the same time, paying its tribute to the Catholic Church by denying no man access to its public services, by proclaiming the common salvation to the whole world, and by admitting to its communion all who can sustain the ordinary tests of the Christian religion. The real state of the case is perceived at once by the construction of an hypothesis which, however wild in itself, may pass unchallenged as an hypothesis. Let us suppose that, by some supreme intervention, the orthodox religious communities of our empire were incorporated into one British Christendom, known as *the Churches of Britain*. Let us suppose an Act of Uniformity passed, defining uniformity to mean the unity of Faith in the Triune God of the common Redemption—meaning thereby all the articles of the Christian faith; and an Act of Toleration leaving to every denomination its own discipline and work in the land and in the world. Let us make such an effort of imagination as to suppose these bodies pervaded by a spirit of unity, perfect mutual confidence, and rivalry only in zeal and devotion. Who does not see that, in such a case, the position of Methodism would be definite and clear? It would be, in all points of its organisation, unimpeachable; and its

terms of membership would be beyond the reach even of friendly challenge. Now, dismissing supposition, we have only to remember that all this is in the highest sense true; what may seem to some an irreverent, and to others an idle, dream, is the profound reality. The Supreme Head perceives a union and a unity which too many of His servants have no faculty to discern, no heart to appreciate. Methodism, without its name, is one branch of His great Church who is the sole Head. However regarded by men below, He beholds it as one organic portion of the universal fellowship that bears His name. United to Himself, and His one Body, by the only bonds that He has prescribed, it is permitted by Him to maintain its own subordinate order, and accomplish its own peculiar work. In His Catholic Church there is the great reality of that which was falsely copied upon earth; there are many societies and orders of which Methodism is one.

With these views, and as independent though not uninterested observers of what is passing, we would again strike the old note, that of the necessity of resisting the spirit of change. Anything like fundamental change there is no fear of; there are a thousand safeguards against that. But many changes may suggest themselves to men smitten with the dire lust of legislation and constitution-mending that may not seem fundamental, but may, nevertheless, touch the foundation; it is against these that prudence must be on its guard. Yet not with a blind and obstinate refusal to admit improvement. Additions may be made that would be improvements, without displacing or weakening any ancient supports. For instance, something may be done to give more precision to the relation sustained by their children, the children whom they receive into the visible Church. If not by that very fact constituted members of the Society, they should be trained to regard that membership as a Christian privilege to which they ought to aspire, and be prepared for it by some modification of the class-meeting adapted to their case. It is much to be feared that between the two memberships their souls are often not fairly dealt with: permitted to undervalue, or rather to ignore altogether the relationship to the Church involved in their baptism, and shrinking from union with the Society, they naturally enough fall into the notion that they have nothing to do with the obligations of the Gospel covenant, and have as yet no part in its provision of blessing. Similar need is there of thoughtful legislation with reference to the relation of those lovers of Methodism,

and friends of the cause of Christ, who persist in keeping aloof from the class-meeting. It is obvious that such legislation must take the direction of giving the ministers a wider latitude in this matter than they have, or exercise, at present. But what precise form such an additional or relaxed membership should assume, it is not for us to discuss.

We are led, however, to another suggestion by the current of these remarks. One very important element in the class-meeting institute, as a bond of organisation, is the assistance it affords to a systematic pastoral supervision. By means of the periodical visitation of the minister, and report to the community, all the members of the body are brought under the cognisance of the Church and its appointed rulers. So far as this function of the class-meeting goes—and it must be remembered that it is only one, and not the main one—every end would be answered by the ministerial class, made an essential part of the ministerial duty. The enrolment in it of such as maintain the Christian life in the sight of the congregation ought to carry, besides the essential privileges it now assures, the full confidence and brotherly recognition of the Society as such. There is no insuperable difficulty in the Methodist economy; and the sentiment of the people would, at no great distance of time, kindly accommodate itself to the modification. Thus the Society and the Church of Methodism would be one; the class-meeting would be seen to be in most perfect harmony with both the sacraments, so often supposed to be invaded by it. And so would a great though needless offence cease.

All this would imply, of course, a wide and deep reform in one respect. The membership in the Society must needs be regarded with a very much more conscientious and scrupulous reverence. Its obligation must be pressingly felt, and acted on both by ministers and people: by the people, remembering their pledges and giving more than their mere names to the class; and by the ministers, administering their own laws with much more diligence and rigour. If this ordinance, appointed by God in its principle and abundantly blessed by God in its form, is of the value that we have assumed it to possess, then it is one of the most peremptory necessities of Methodism to administer and watch over it with a more loyal fidelity than in many cases has been shown of late. Whilst critics and controversialists are composing their beclouded attacks on the institute itself, let those who are its responsible guardians keep silence and do their duty.

The observations which we purposed making on the third head—the work of Methodism—must be postponed. They may probably pass into another form, while adhering to the same general subject, and keeping the same end in view,—the conservation of all that is essential, and such wholesome change as may increase the efficiency of one of the most important instruments that it pleases the Head of the Church to use in the accomplishment of His will.

---



ART. II.—1. *The Paris Journals.*

2. *The London Journals.*

3. *Correspondence respecting the Negotiations preliminary to the War between France and Prussia.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of her Majesty. London: Harrison and Sons.

On Monday, June 27th, the Earl of Clarendon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, died, unexpectedly, after a few hours' illness. On Monday, July 4th, it was announced that he would be succeeded by Earl Granville. On Tuesday, July 5th, the new Minister was informed by Mr. Hammond, who had for many years been permanent Under-Secretary, and is one of the most experienced foreign politicians in Europe, that in all his experience he had never known so great a lull in foreign politics.\* We do not know if Lord Granville rejoiced at or regretted this statement. In either case the emotion which it excited was to be of short duration. That same afternoon, as he was sitting in his place as leader of the House of Lords, he received a telegram from Mr. Layard, our Minister at Madrid announcing that the Spanish Provisional Government had determined to offer the Spanish crown to Prince Leopold, of Hohenzollern. During the course of the same afternoon Lord Granville received a telegram from Lord Lyons also, describing the bad impression which this resolution, on the part of Marshal Prim and the Regent Serrano, had produced on the French Government. This "lull" had lasted something under two hours, so far as Lord Granville was concerned, and it must have been with the conviction he had plenty of work before him, that on the following day, July 6th, he went to Windsor in order to kiss hands and receive the seals of his office from the Queen. About the same hour the Duke of Gramont, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared in the Corps Législatif, amid excited cheers, that if the Prince of Hohenzollern's candidature was persisted in, "we (the French Government) shall know how to do our duty without hesitation and without weakness." That same

\* It must not be supposed that our Government was to blame for its inability to foresee the approaching catastrophe. Less than a week before, the French Prime Minister, M. Ollivier, had declared that never had the political atmosphere been so clear.

afternoon, after Lord Granville's return from Windsor, the Marquis de la Valette, French Ambassador to Great Britain, called upon our Foreign Minister, spoke in grave terms of the difficulty which had arisen, and asked the good offices of this country to prevent a serious rupture. Lord Granville willingly promised his aid, but pointed out how much more difficult his work had been rendered by the strong language which had been used by the French Government to Baron Werther, the Prussian Minister at Paris. A little later came a telegram which showed that the task was even more difficult than Lord Granville had supposed. A message from Lord Lyons gave a summary of the Duke of Gramont's address in the French Chamber. It was clear that the lull of Tuesday afternoon had suddenly given way to a storm violent enough then, and threatening to become a very hurricane. That same Wednesday evening Lord Granville wrote an urgent despatch to Lord Augustus Loftus, our Minister at Berlin, informing him of the very serious way in which Prince Leopold's candidature was viewed by France, urging him to use all his influence, consistent with the respect due to Prussia, in order to dissuade the King from sanctioning this candidature, and reminding him that "some of the greatest calamities in the world have been produced by small causes, and by mistakes trivial in their origin." The next day Lord Granville wrote two despatches to Mr. Layard, with much the same purport, and showing that it could never be to the advantage of Spain for a prince to mount her throne when his elevation would be certain to bring on great European calamities.

Let us now see what had been taking place in Paris. On Sunday, July 3rd, the French Government received a Madrid telegram announcing the determination of the Regent and Marshal Prim. The next morning M. Ollivier and the Duke of Gramont had a long interview with the Emperor, at St. Cloud, and it was resolved to send for the Prussian Ambassador. As soon as Baron Werther had arrived, he was informed "categorically" by the Duke of Gramont that to this (the ascent of the Spanish throne by a Prussian Prince) "France will not resign herself; and when I say that we shall not resign ourselves to it, I mean that we shall not permit it, and that we shall use our whole strength to prevent it." The Prussian Minister declared that he knew absolutely nothing of the affair, that he believed his Government was equally a stranger to it, and that he considered it to be a mere family matter. The reply only drew forth more emphatic protests from the Duke, and at last he plainly told the Ambassador

that if the Prince was not withdrawn a catastrophe would ensue. Baron Werther, agitated, and almost in tears, asked the Duke to define what he meant by "catastrophe." Was it a menace of war? M. Ollivier then broke in and said, "In the name of the Emperor, and of his Government, I reply, yes, it is a menace of war." By this time the French journals had become exceedingly excited, and on the following day M. Cochery, one of the members of the Corps Législatif, addressed an "interpellation" respecting Spanish affairs, to which the Duke of Gramont made the reply already referred to, and which was nothing less than the open repetition of the threat of war, wherewith he had menaced the Prussian Minister privately.

Lord Granville was not the only person to appreciate the complication which had so suddenly arisen. The London Stock Exchange estimated its importance as fully as the Foreign Office had done, and Thursday, July 7th, witnessed what was then called a panic, though it was but a passing shiver compared with that strong convulsion which shook the money market on Monday, July 18th, when it became rumoured (untruly as it turned out) that Russia had joined Prussia. The panic of that day was equal in severity to that of Black Friday, when Overend, Gurney, and Co., closed their doors. In these twelve days—July 7th to 18th—Europe had passed from a state of apparent profound tranquillity to a state of war on a gigantic scale. Day by day, Lord Granville, seconded by Lord Lyons, Lord Augustus Loftus, and Mr. Layard, had continued his noble but difficult task of mediation. At one moment he seemed to have succeeded. On July 11th, the father of Prince Leopold withdrew his son's candidature, and M. Ollivier went so far as to declare "the incident is at an end." Events soon showed that the Prime Minister of France was one of the worst informed men in that country. His colleague at the Foreign Office took a very different view of the position, and referred in satirical terms to the lobby confidences of his chief. At this very time, when the Premier was declaring the crisis over, and when the semi-official *Constitutionnel* was rejoicing at the preservation of peace, the Duke of Gramont was pressing the King of Prussia to announce his disapproval of Prince Leopold's candidature, and to promise that no member of the royal house of Hohenzollern should ever seek to sit on the throne of Spain. Lord Granville frankly told the French Government that they had no right to make such a demand, and Lord Lyons was instructed to say that Great Britain

considered France should be content with the renunciation of Prince Leopold. At the same time, in order that there might be no room for proceeding further in this matter, Lord A. Loftus was told to press the King to announce his approval of Prince Leopold's withdrawal. Count Bismarck replied that he could not urge this proposal upon the King, and said that any fresh concession on the part of Prussia to "the arbitrary will of France would be viewed in the light of a humiliation, which the national feeling throughout Germany would certainly repudiate as a fresh insult." In the meanwhile both sides were preparing for the war which was seen to be inevitable. The strong language of the French Foreign Minister, re-echoed by the majority of the French journals—though to their credit be it said that the ablest of them, notably the *Débats*, the *Siècle*, and the *Temps*, did what they could to allay the agitation—had kindled a dangerous excitement. It is alleged that this was purposely fomented by the Duke of Gramont, who hired the roughs of Paris at so many sous a head to parade the streets and shout for war. The statement seems only too probable, when read in the light of the negotiations of the next few days. M. Ollivier had declared in the Corps Législatif that France passionately desired peace. There was no symptom of any such desire on the part of his colleague. On July 11th, M. Emmanuel Arago, having asked if the demands of France upon Prussia were confined to the Hohenzollern candidature, was insulted by the Duke of Gramont, and told, amid the shouts of the Chamber, that it was easy to see that he (M. Arago) had been ambassador at Berlin. On the following day Lord Lyons pointed out to the Duke that, if France did not accept the renunciation of Prince Leopold, she "would have the opinion throughout the world against her, and her antagonist would have all the advantage of being manifestly forced into the war in self-defence to repel an attack." This emphatic declaration on the part of our ambassador was followed up by one, if possible more emphatic, on the part of Lord Granville, who not only laid upon France "the immense responsibility that would rest on her if she should seek to enlarge the grounds of quarrel," but denied that England had, as the Duke of Gramont had asserted, admitted that the original grievances of France were legitimate. On Wednesday, July 13th, the Duke again addressed both Chambers, but had little else to communicate except that the negotiations with Prussia were not yet concluded. They were soon to be so. That afternoon M. Benedetti, the French

Ambassador to the Prussian Court, pressed once more upon the King of Prussia, who was then at Ems, the demand which he had made before, and which the King had refused,—namely, that the King should promise that Prince Leopold should not accept the crown on any future occasion, if it were offered to him. It was while the King was walking on the public promenade that M. Benedetti approached him to urge this demand. The King, on hearing the nature of it, told his aide-de-camp to inform the Ambassador that he, the King, had nothing more to say to him. The crowd of holiday loungers who witnessed this incident stood aghast. It was speedily communicated to the German newspapers, and in a few hours was telegraphed to every part of Europe. There was but one more stage in the negotiations. Napoleon demanded a letter of apology from King William; it was refused; and on Friday, July 15th, an official ministerial communication was made simultaneously in both the French Chambers, informing them that France had been insulted in the person of her Ambassador, and that she accepted the war which had been offered to her. It would be almost impossible to describe the excitement which followed. In the Corps Législatif the Liberals made one more effort in behalf of peace. The Ministers had accused the Prussian Government of sending a despatch to all the European Courts, announcing that King William had refused to see M. Benedetti. "Produce this despatch," said M. Jules Favre. "We were deceived once before with regard to Mexico; let us not be deceived again." The Ministers refused to produce it,—in truth the despatch did not exist,—and taunted those who asked for it with being very slow to understand questions of honour. In spite of the taunt, M. Favre pressed his motion to a division, and no fewer than eighty-three deputies supported it. Nevertheless, he was beaten by almost two to one. It was not the last time that the Liberal party endeavoured to stem the flood of war. But such was the force of it, such was the rapidity wherewith it rose, that on the very next day, when divisions were taken upon granting credits for the war, the minority was only ten and at last only one. Out of doors the excitement was almost unparalleled. Hour after hour the streets were thronged with processions shouting for war and singing the Marseillaise, which until then had been most rigorously forbidden. Counter demonstrations in behalf of peace were dispersed by the police. The Prussian Ambassador's official residence narrowly escaped destruction at the hands of the

roughs. The Liberal journals, which had hitherto pleaded for peace, confessed that their efforts were useless, and that they must accept the war as an accomplished fact, and show that they were not less patriotic than their warlike contemporaries. On the day after the declaration of war, M. Rouher, ex-Minister of State ("Vice-Emperor" he used to be called), but now President of the Senate, headed a deputation of the Senate to the Emperor at St. Cloud, and made the memorable avowal that the Emperor had "known how to wait," and had been "occupied during the last four years in perfecting the armament and the organisation of the army." The formal declaration of war was conveyed by Count Wimpffen on the part of France, and delivered to the Prussian Government on Tuesday, July 19th.

It is not our intention to describe minutely the progress of this war. We are concerned less with the campaign than with the circumstances which led to it; less with military movements than with political events. The first effect of the war was the welding together into one homogeneous and formidable military power the whole of the German States. Napoleon effected in an instant what Bismarck had been endeavouring for years to accomplish. It was very far from completed in the second week of July. Before the end of the third week the unification of Germany was an accomplished fact, and Napoleon, who had intended to announce himself as the champion of the South German States against the tyranny of Prussia, found them instantaneously, and with one simultaneous movement, arrayed against himself. Throughout the whole of Germany, from the Baltic to the Boden See, the quarrel, fastened by France upon Prussia, was accepted as a wrong common to all. The hope of a sudden advance upon any of the Prussian strongholds was then abandoned by the Emperor; and though he might, in consequence of the unprepared state of Germany, have marched to Frankfort almost unopposed, he hesitated, gave the Prussians time to bring up their forces to the French frontier, and allowed the first serious engagement of the war to be won by the Crown Prince of Prussia on French soil.

During the pause that intervened between the march of troops to the Rhine and the firing of the first gun, an incident occurred, so startling, that, for a time, it almost eclipsed the interest of the approaching gigantic conflict. On Monday, July 25th, the *Times* published, in French, a projected treaty between France and Prussia. This astounding document consisted of five clauses. In the first, Napoleon recognised



the conquests made by Prussia in the war of 1866. In the second, the King of Prussia promised to facilitate the acquisition by France of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg from the King of Holland. In the third, France promised not to oppose the federal union of the South German States with the North German Confederation, with a common Parliament. In the fourth,—but we must give the precise words of this extraordinary article:—“*De son côté sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse au cas où sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français serait amené par les circonstances à faire entrer ses troupes en Belgique ou à la conquérir, accordera le secours de ses armes à la France, et il la soutiendra avec toutes ses forces de terre et de mer envers et contre toute Puissance qui, dans cette éventualité, lui déclarerait la guerre.*” The fifth article bound the two contracting powers to make a defensive and offensive alliance for the purpose of carrying out the four other articles. On the same day the *Daily Telegraph* published, in its largest type, a letter signed “An Englishman,” which described an interview the writer had just had with Napoleon. In that interview Napoleon said that, after the war of 1866, he had reminded Bismarck of the friendly neutrality of France, and had urged that, as some recompense, the Prussian Minister should aid France to acquire Luxemburg. In reply, Bismarck had said that he could not sanction the alienation of one foot of territory: but what would France want if Prussia took Holland? To this question the Emperor had, according to his own statement, replied, that any attempt upon Holland would mean war with France. This conversation the Emperor authorised his visitor to make known; and it was accordingly communicated to the London newspaper which has always been credited with peculiarly intimate relations with Napoleon. The Emperor, no doubt, intended his statement to win for him the sympathy and, at least, the moral support of England. That result might, in some measure, have been obtained but for the simultaneous publication of the infamous *Projet de Traité* in the *Times*. The incredulity with which this document might have been received was removed when read in the light of the Emperor’s conversation with “An Englishman.” It became clear that there had been *pourparlers*, having for their object the territorial aggrandisement of France: the Emperor himself admitted so much. It was no less clear that the Emperor had revealed only so much of them as suited his purpose, only as much as he thought would convince the world of Bismarck’s treachery and his own magnanimity. So damaging was the *Projet*

that the London *Standard*, an extreme Imperialist partisan, declared it to be apocryphal; the Paris *Liberté* declared that it was a forgery committed by Bismarck; and even the grave and semi-official *Constitutionnel* ascribed it to the same author. He lost no time in disproving the charge. The Treaty was in the Foreign Office Archives at Berlin, and all the world might inspect it, and see that it was in the handwriting of M. Benedetti. Compelled to acknowledge that it was so, the Paris journals and their analogues in London declared—M. Benedetti himself declared—that he had, “in some sort,” written it at the dictation of Bismarck. That the North German Chancellor should gravely propose an undertaking of this most serious and perilous nature, and in which all the advantages were conferred upon France, was not to be credited. Beaten from this position, the French journals were instructed to admit that *pourparlers* had indeed taken place, but M. Benedetti’s proposal had not been approved by his Imperial master. Then came fresh revelations. Bismarck informed the German and the English press that not only had negotiations of this kind been urged persistently for a long period of time, but he had reason to know that if he had not published the Treaty in the *Times*, it would have been proposed again on the present occasion as the means of avoiding war, Prussia and France thereupon to turn their arms against Belgium and any powers that might come to her assistance. Nor was this all. Benedetti had not been the only tempter. Prince Napoleon had proposed that France should take Piedmont and the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland. At the same time, Bismarck took care to make it known that before the war of 1866 Napoleon had offered to send 300,000 men against Austria, if Prussia would pay for the alliance in territory. The effect which these disclosures produced was prodigious. So far as Napoleon was concerned, they isolated him from the rest of Europe, with the exception of Denmark and Sweden. They showed how hypocritical had been his expressions of concern for the South German States; how false was his pretended friendship for the Emperor of Austria; how untrustworthy was his alliance with England; how little mercy Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Italy could hope for at his hands, if he once saw his way to seize upon any portion of their territory. Denmark he might indeed still hope to win by a campaign which should have for one of its objects the restoration of Schleswig. He might also hope to purchase the neutrality of the Italian Government by the withdrawal

of his troops from Rome. But it was in vain for him to look for allies in any other quarter. In England the impression produced by the Treaty was most painful. Lord Russell, ten years before, when France annexed Nice and Savoy, had declared that thenceforward England must seek for other allies. But the annexation of those provinces was not a matter in which England had any personal interest. She was not bound by treaty to protect their independence. They contained no Antwerp, the possession of which would enable France to "hold a loaded pistol" at her heart. But to maintain the independence of Belgium concerned both England's honour and safety. On the day-week after the treaty was published, on Monday, August 2nd, Mr. Stansfeld laid upon the table of the House of Commons, amid vociferous cheers from all parts of the densely-crowded chamber, the estimate for a supplementary vote of £2,000,000, to include, among other expenses, the raising of 20,000 fresh troops. During the same week, and in consequence of the strong expressions of opinion in both Houses of Parliament and in the public journals, the Government intimated—without menace, but also without obscurity—their intention to maintain the independence of Belgium, even by force of arms, if necessary. To prevent that contingency, a treaty, identical in terms, was signed by England and France, and by England and the North German Confederation, by which it was agreed that this country would enter into alliance with either of the two other powers, in order to protect Belgium, if its safety should be imperilled by the third. This treaty, though unfavourably criticised by Lord Cairns and Mr. Bernal Osborne, was highly commended by Mr. Disraeli, who described it as "both a wise and spirited policy—wise because it was spirited."

French politics are essentially foreign politics. In tracing their progress for the last five years we shall constantly find matters touching the internal administration of France mixed up with great European questions. It is related by a distinguished English diplomatist and ex-ambassador, that being at an English country-house while the Orleans family were ruling France, and at the zenith of their power, he conversed with a fellow-guest, Louis Napoleon, then and for many years previously an exile residing in England, and asked him what he would do when he became Emperor of France. The Prince unfolded his programme with the most perfect confidence, never doubting for a moment that he would, sooner or later, realise it. It was this. France must possess a great fleet,

equal to England's. French commercial enterprise and energy must open the way in the East to French supremacy in Egypt. France must extend her colonial possessions, and in doing so there would of necessity be a contest between the Latin and the Teutonic races. European wars were inevitable, and the result of them would be to make France supreme in the South of the Continent, and Germany stand in awe of France in the North. Meanwhile matters at home were not to be neglected. Municipalities were to be encouraged to beautify and adorn the various cities of the land, not only to give employment to labour, but also to serve as a counterpoise to that spirit of centralisation in the government which an absolute rule needed and could not dispense with. And at last, when policy—when necessity demanded, added the embryo-Emperor, "We war with you in England. There are but two questions on which you will fight; but on these you must fight, or be reduced to a position which neither the ambition nor the interest of France need be concerned to diminish."\* To this programme Napoleon has adhered with marvellous tenacity. The fleet has been created, and if not equal to the English, is superior to that of every other nation in the world. The Suez Canal has given France prevailing influence in Egypt. The Mexican adventure was a grand effort to establish a colonial empire—was a signal instance of the predicted conflict between Latins and Teutons, though, as it turned out, *not* an instance of Latin victory. European wars have been no fewer than six in number† since Napoleon first became ruler of France, and it is not the Emperor's fault, but Bismarck's, that the Italian war of 1859, and the German war of 1866, have not made France all-powerful in the South of Europe, and Germany weak and divided. France has been beautified; that is one penny-worth of domestic bread to all this intolerable quantity of foreign sack. And now, at last, we were two months ago suddenly brought face to face with the Emperor upon one of those two chosen battle-fields, where we must fight or cease to be a European Power: Belgium to wit, Turkey being the other. It is not often that plans laid a quarter of a century in advance, and so seemingly impossible of execution, have

\* This very remarkable conversation is reported by Mr. Charles Lever, in *Blackwood's Magazine* for June, 1868. Other articles by the same writer, under his pseudonym of "Cornelius O'Dowd," exhibit an amount of insight into foreign, and especially Napoleonist, politics, which, viewed in the sight of subsequent events, is almost marvellous.

† The Dano-German war of 1849—51; the Russian war of 1854—56; the Italian war of 1859; the Dano-German war of 1864; the German war of 1866; the Franco-Prussian war of 1870.

been fulfilled in such large measure as those which we have just detailed. But even Napoleon was not infallible. Even he was liable to checks and rebuffs. At the time that he sketched this programme, sitting by an English fireside, the names of Camillo Cavour and Otto von Bismarck were unknown. Yet the first was to frustrate French predominance in Southern Europe by creating an Italian Kingdom in the place of the weak confederation of Italian States patronised by the Lord of the Tuileries, and which it was Napoleon's intention to establish when he went to war in 1859; the other was to frustrate no less French predominance in Northern Europe by constructing a United Germany instead of the "three trunks," each of which was to be too weak to withstand the Imperial axe if once the Imperial fiat went forth for its destruction.

It will have been observed that in the Imperial programme there was no thought of any room for the development of political liberty. France was to be the dictator of Europe, and Frenchmen, satisfied with that proud position, were neither to ask nor to care for self-government. Speaking at Lille, in August, 1867, at a time when he was suspected of preparing for a war with Prussia, and when his failure in Mexico had exposed him to very severe attacks in the Corps Législatif, the Emperor remarked, "It is only weak Governments which seek in foreign complications a diversion from embarrassments at home." It is but justice to Napoleon to admit that his foreign policy was not an expedient devised to extricate himself from domestic difficulties. His policy was always essentially foreign; and so far as it was domestic at all, it was so involuntarily on his part, and in consequence of failures in his main design. It was the domestic policy that was the exception resorted to in order to divert attention from difficulties abroad. The present war was, no doubt, in some measure, prompted by the necessity of extricating himself from the desperate condition in which he found himself at home, in consequence of the repeated disastrous failures that he had experienced abroad. But this war was not, as so many British wars in times past have been, entered upon solely to stave off internal reforms. It was a part and parcel of the policy which was deliberately settled at the outset, and which has been persistently followed ever since under reverses no less than after successes. In a word, Napoleon was nothing when he was not rearranging the map of Europe to the advantage of France. Nor would there have been any peace in Europe so long as he was in a position to give effect to his geographical projects.

It was in the autumn of 1865 that Count Bismarck paid a visit to Napoleon at Biarritz. The visit must have suggested a memorable one paid by another statesman to the same host, at Plombières, in July, 1858. On that occasion Napoleon told his visitor, Count Cavour, "There are but three men in Europe, and two of them are in this room." The "two" devised the war against Austria which was fought in the following spring. The third of the "only three men in Europe" was certainly not Count Bismarck. At that time his name was unknown outside his own country. But by 1865, not only had Cavour died, but Bismarck had become the most prominent politician on the Continent. This Biarritz conference is now, and has been for some time, an open secret, just as the Plombières conference became. It is known that the German war was arranged, and that negotiations were carried on as to the price which France was to be paid for friendly neutrality, or, should the need arise, for armed intervention. One of the interlocutors of that conversation has declared that the other offered to send an army of 300,000 men against Austria, if a suitable payment were made. The events which followed render the statement credible enough.

When the year 1866 opened, it was known that the "Latin" experiment in Mexico had failed. The American civil war being ended, the Government of Washington told Napoleon that he must clear out from the American continent, and the Emperor had no choice but to comply, or else to wage war with the army and navy of the United States, flushed with victory. This undertaking did not commend itself to one who had the rearrangement of the map of Europe on hand. Moreover, the Mexican Empire had long been hopeless, and the drain of troops and treasure which it had caused for the past four years could not possibly be maintained in the presence of the loud and angry complaints of the anti-Imperialists. The debate on the Address which took place at the opening of the French Chambers, was signalised by some terribly damaging charges against the Imperial policy. M. Thiers denounced, in scathing language, the various Imperial expeditions. M. Buffet, one of the most moderate of the Liberals, moved an amendment on the Address, and the division showed that the Opposition had increased four-fold since the previous year—from 16 to 63. But the Emperor had not, at that time, suffered such signal defeat as to feel himself compelled to yield increased political liberty. M. Rouher declared that his master would have none of the "gentle, easy, *glissante*, imperceptible, but fatal, slide towards Parliament-



arism." He would rather abdicate than submit to the Procrustean bed of Parliamentary Government. M. Rouher did not say—for the time was not yet come for saying—that his master had other and far different projects on hand, another "revindication" of French frontiers. In France the pamphleteer plays as important a part as the diplomatist. He is an ambassador at home, and his pamphlets are the means by which he sounds the public mind. Early in April one of these brochures appeared, which described Bismarck as the Richelieu of Germany, charged with the work of consolidating that country; and France was told that her duty consisted in making a durable alliance with Prussia, who, to that end, would restore to France the fortress of Saarlouis and the coal mines of Saarbrück. A month later, M. Thiers made another of his brilliant, but selfish, speeches, in which he praised the treaty of Vienna, because it kept Italy and Germany divided, and thus gave to France the leading position in Europe. Three days later, May 6th, the Emperor paid a visit to Auxerre, and declared that he always breathed more freely among the working population of France, because they, like him, "detested the treaties of 1815, which it is now sought to make the sole basis of our foreign policy." This speech produced a profound impression throughout Europe. At that time, war between Prussia and Austria was seen to be almost inevitable, and it was held that this avowal of hostility to the settlement which followed Waterloo meant that the Emperor intended to have his share of the spoils of the coming campaign. There were those who said, even at this early period, that the Emperor had made up his mind to seize Belgium.\*

It is no part of our business to detail the abortive negotiations between the two chief German Powers, the hypocritical proposals for a conference, and the startling and brilliant campaign which drove the Austrians out of Italy, and laid Vienna open to capture by the victorious Prussian army. Two days before hostilities commenced Napoleon wrote a letter to his Foreign Minister, M. Drouyn de Lhuys, saying, that had the conference met, he would have repudiated all idea of territorial aggrandisement so long as the equilibrium of Europe was not disturbed. He wished for Germany, closer union; for Prussia, greater homogeneousness; for Austria, a great position in Germany; for Italy, Venetia. But he was assured that now no interest touching France would be settled

---

\* See an able article in the *Spectator* of May 12, 1866.

without her assent. Yet, he added, "We might think of an extension of our frontiers in the event of the map of Europe being remodelled for the benefit of any great Power, and of conterminous provinces demanding, by votes freely expressed, their annexation to France." As the very object of the war was the disturbance of the European equilibrium—was the remodelling of the map of Europe for the benefit of a great Power—Prussia,—this manifesto was a distinct claim for fresh territory on the part of the Emperor, and it was couched in such terms that it might include, not only the country of the Saar, but Belgium, Geneva, and the Palatinate. His course was clear. He had but to look on while Prussia and Austria fought; and when the former power needed his help, as he did not doubt she would, it would be for him to give it—"for a consideration." The rapid success of General Moltke and Prince Frederick Charles completely overturned Napoleon's schemes. Prussia had not needed his aid. How, then, could he claim his reward? Nevertheless, he did claim it, and formally demanded the French boundary of 1814, which included the fortresses of Saarlouis and Landau in Germany, and Philippeville and Martenburg in Belgium.

It is possible that Bismarck would have complied; but the King of Prussia, after long council with his ministers and some of the successful generals of the war, refused his assent, and Bismarck had to tell his fellow-conspirator of the previous autumn that German feeling would not suffer King William to part with an inch of German territory. This was a terrible blow for Napoleon. He had thought to obliterate the remembrance of his defeat in the Western hemisphere by a great success in the Eastern, and the only result was a fresh and more humiliating rebuff. For a time he dissembled his rage and mortification. The French journals at first denied that any demand had been made; but the falsehood was soon exposed, since the Emperor, in an interview with the Prussian Ambassador, defended the wish for new frontier as natural, and added that he had given expression to that wish only for the sake of the French people. Then, with a touch of Mr. Toots, he intimated that it was of no consequence, that he hoped to keep on friendly terms with Prussia, but that she must not cross the Mein. At the same time he wrote to the King of the Belgians to say that he had far too great a regard for that sovereign to think of despoiling him. Though the Emperor thus attempted to make light of his defeat, he gave one strong proof that he had felt it acutely. He dismissed his Foreign Secretary, M. Drouyn de Lhuys, who had con-

ducted the abortive negotiations, and who wanted his sovereign to make war; and though Napoleon spoke of his "devotion to me and the dynasty," the dismissal of the minister was so summary that he was not even allowed to remain in office the fortnight that must elapse before his successor, the Marquis de Moustier, then ambassador at Constantinople, could arrive in Paris. During that interval, the Marquis de la Valette acted as Foreign Minister. This statesman made good use of his time. On September 17th, he addressed a circular to the French representatives at Foreign Courts, in which he explained the reasons why the Emperor had assented to the new order of things. The real reason—that France could not help herself—was, of course, not given. The reason assigned was, that the treaty of 1815 having been broken up, France must seek new alliances. "France can only desire such territorial aggrandisement as does not impugn her territorial cohesion." The semi-official, but now defunct, *Etendard*, explained that oracular sentence to mean, "those who speak our language, share our traditions, and enjoy our laws." In a word, the claim to German territory was abandoned, and France would look, henceforth, to Belgium on the North, and Switzerland on the south.

This manifesto was followed, in the ensuing month (October, 1866), by a decree from the Emperor ordering a Commission to report on the reorganisation of the French army. The Commission consisted of six ministers, the marshals of France, and several generals. A month later, the *Moniteur de l'Armée* announced that the Emperor intended to constitute a new reserve. Before the close of the year, it was stated that the annual draft for the army would be raised from 100,000 to 160,000 men; and that by 1872 France would have an army 1,232,215 strong. This announcement, which would have been serious and ominous at any time, was rendered more so by the fact, that just at that time the French army was being recalled from Rome, according to the September Convention of 1864 with the Italian Government, as we detailed in an earlier Number of this Review.\* It was evident that Napoleon intended to make France a nation of soldiers; and so unfavourably was the project received, that it became necessary for the Emperor, if he would persuade the Corps Législatif to pass the necessary law at all, to coax it into doing so by certain concessions to the Liberal party. Accordingly, on January 19th, 1867, there

---

\* See *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1865, pp. 468 et seq.

appeared an Imperial decree, stating that the Emperor wished to "give to the institutions of the Empire all the development of which they are capable, and to the public liberties a new extension," without compromising the power entrusted to him. Then followed the proposed changes. The debate on the Address was abolished because it "needlessly excited public attention," and was generally "sterile." By way of compensation for this loss, the right of interpellation was restored; but the Emperor took care to guard it effectually, by subjecting it to the condition that four out of nine committees, to which all questions should be referred, should approve before any could be put. A more liberal Press-law was promised, so that anyone should be at liberty to start a newspaper who deposited a certain amount of caution money. Also the right of holding political public meetings was granted, subject to very stringent precautions, including the presence of a police-agent to keep order, and to prevent the speakers from travelling beyond the subject of discussion, which they must have previously announced. The speaking ministers, ministers without portfolios, were abolished, and the official ministers were empowered to defend themselves in the Chambers. But it was expressly stated there was "no solidarity among ministers," they remained dependent upon the chief of the State. As soon as the decree was published, the Emperor "invited" his ministers to resign. They did so in a body, fully expecting to be reappointed. But Napoleon took advantage of their resignation to effect some very important changes. He did not reappoint M. Fould, the Minister of Finance, who had endeavoured to reduce the public expenditure, for economy was not to be the order of the day. M. Rouher, the Minister of State, assumed M. Fould's office while retaining his own. M. Forcade de la Roquette, a reactionary, succeeded M. Behic as Minister of Agriculture. Admiral Rigault de Genouilly succeeded M. Chasseloup-Laubat, a civilian, as Minister of Marine. But the most significant change was that by which Marshal Randon had to surrender the Ministry of War to General Niel. It was essentially a war ministry; a ministry whose main object was to prepare for war while passing other measures, merely in order to pacify the French people, and reconcile them to the new military arrangements. Nevertheless, in announcing these changes, Napoleon declared that they were "the crowning of the edifice" of liberty.

Early in February, 1867, there came bad news from Mexico. It became useless to conceal any longer the desperate con-

dition of the Mexican empire. On the 14th of the same month, the Emperor of the French opened the Chambers, and made a speech that was wonderfully apologetic and conciliatory. He admitted the failure in Mexico, but declared that the idea of a Latin empire in America was a noble one. He claimed for his German policy that it had been successful, inasmuch as it had prevented the Prussians from entering Venice. Then, by way of disguising the true nature of the intended reorganisation of the army, he said, "Our task is to form the public manners to the model of more liberal institutions." This sort of talk did not blind the Liberal party to the true nature of the Emperor's policy. M. Jules Favre, in an impassioned speech on the abolition of the debate upon the Address, said to M. Rouher, "We hold everything at the will of one man." A few days later M. Thiers delivered a tremendous philippic against the foreign policy of the Emperor. It was masterly as an exposure of Imperial blunders: it was detestable as an exposition of a national foreign policy. France was to be the supreme arbitrator of the Continent, and any step that she took which strengthened other nations was, according to the Orleanist ex-minister, a blunder and a crime. M. Rouher, in the course of his reply, declared that, even tried by M. Thiers' test, the Emperor had done wisely, for by the war of 1866 Germany had become greatly weakened, and was now divided into three trunks—Prussia, Austria, and the South German States: the last being wholly independent of, and by no means favourable to, the first. Scarcely had the Parisians had time to digest the *trois tronçons* theory, when the Prussian papers published the secret treaty signed in the previous August, whereby Bavaria bound itself to place its army under the control of Prussia. It was further stated that Baden and Hesse Darmstadt were about to follow the same course, and that Würtemberg alone declined to do so. Here was another terrible blow for the Emperor. He had given Bismarck to understand that he must not cross the Mein at the peril of incurring the Imperial displeasure, and no sooner did the Emperor openly plume himself upon having set bounds to the Prussian minister's ambition, than that minister, with cynical insolence, announced that he had passed those bounds eight months before.

The exasperation produced by this revelation was intense. But the time was not yet arrived for the Emperor to make an open demonstration of his anger. The Champ de Mars was just at that juncture converted into a temple of peace. An

international exhibition was just about to be opened. The Paris shopkeepers were eagerly anticipating the stream of wealth which was to be poured in upon them from all quarters of the globe, and to have disappointed them would have brought about a revolution. Moreover, though General Niel had been working hard, two months did not suffice to supply the army with a weapon that would cope with the *Zündnadelgewehr*, which had gained the victory of Sadowa. It was a time for negotiations rather than for menaces, and a way seemed open to the Emperor by which he could retrieve his past ill-fortune. Encouraged, there is reason to suppose, by Bismarck, Napoleon entered into negotiations with the King of Holland for the purchase of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, together with its fortress-capital, the Gibraltar of Central Europe. No sooner had the transaction become noised abroad, and Napoleon stood committed to it, than ominous murmurs began to be heard in Germany. Prussia had long enjoyed the right of garrisoning Luxemburg for the King of Holland, and the thought of seeing Prussian troops withdrawn from this famous stronghold in order to make way for French troops, who would thus be almost within cannon-shot of the ancient Schwarzthor of Trier (Trèves), excited violent protests. How far Bismarck fomented, or foresaw, this agitation, we cannot tell. It is generally understood that King William positively declined to assent to the arrangement, and was prepared to go to war in order to prevent it. The King of Holland, alarmed at the turn this affair had taken, wished to withdraw from it. But Napoleon felt it was impossible that he could submit to another check at the hand of his so often victorious adversary. Though the chassepôts were not ready, troops were moved to the frontier, and every preparation was made for a campaign. Better that the exhibition should be spoilt, and the Paris shopkeepers disappointed, than that the man who had just been sending invitations to all the kings of the earth should be thus befooled again. At this crisis England interposed, and Napoleon, nothing loth, accepted the proposition of a Conference. The Conference met in London on May 7th, and it terminated its labours on May 11th. During those five days France and Prussia were within twenty-four hours of hostilities. It rested with Lord Stanley to decide if the dogs of war should be let loose. After a sleepless night, and hours of painful anxiety, he assented against his better judgment to join in a collective guarantee for the neutrality of Luxemburg, thinking that, of two evils, the nearer one was the greater, and



that the responsibility thus undertaken by England was, though most undesirable, less of an evil than a war between the two chief military powers in the world. As a matter of fact, the guarantee is a very small evil. It is not a collective and several guarantee; it is collective only; and, therefore, if any one of the powers, who signed the treaty, chooses to violate it, the others may, if they please, claim to be no longer bound by it. In other words, the agreement is binding only so long as those whom it concerns agree to consider it so. This was not a very high effort of diplomacy certainly; but it had the desired effect of salving the Emperor's wounded susceptibilities, and postponing war for three years. The conditions of the treaty were that the Duchy of Luxemburg should be guaranteed its neutrality, that the fortress should be dismantled, and the Prussian troops withdrawn. The second condition is very far from fulfilled up to the present time; and if either of the contending armies had seized the city, they could, in a few days, have rendered it all but impregnable.

The Luxemburg affair having been settled, certainly without credit to France, the festivities in connection with the exhibition went on without interruption. A constant succession of royal guests filled the Tuileries. It was a *parterre des rois*, and, for the moment, Napoleon seemed the most courted and popular man in Europe. Two incidents occurred which ruffled the otherwise brilliant season. While the Emperor was driving out in the Bois de Boulogne with the Czar, a Pole fired at the former sovereign, and both emperors had a narrow escape. At the very height of the splendours of this splendid year came the news of the death of the Emperor Maximilian at Queretaro. The contrast between the magnificence of the one emperor, and the miserable fate of the other, deserted by the first, was unspeakably tragic. But no ghost of the Mexican Banquo appears to have troubled the French Macbeth. The *fêtes* continued without change of programme, except that the Emperor of Austria abandoned his promised visit to Paris. Instead of royal banquets, there awaited him another pageant—a sad and sorrowful pageant—the corpse of his murdered brother brought home to Miramar from the land which had promised him a crown, and gave him a coffin. The King of Prussia did not disappoint Napoleon; but though the Emperor was flattered by the presence of the soldier-king, it was noticed that his host looked *distrained* and ill at ease during King William's visit. None the less for that visit did the preparations for war go on steadily and unceasingly. None

the less did the Emperor and his lieutenant force the Army Bill through the Corps Legislatif. It was during the stormy debates to which this measure gave rise, that M. Emile Ollivier, then one of the most eminent of the Opposition leaders, called M. Rouher the Vice-Emperor. The minister was consoled for the attacks made upon him by an Imperial present in the shape of a Grand Cross set in diamonds, and worth 60,000 francs. It may be taken for granted that the proposals offered by Napoleon to the King of Prussia, or to his minister, were rejected. The nature of them was not openly stated at the time; but it is worthy of note that from this period dates the more avowed, and almost ostentatious, intimacy between England and Belgium. King Leopold, doubtless, learnt about this time that the annexation of his kingdom to France had been discussed by French and Prussian diplomatists. Thus it came to pass that while Napoleon was fêting the sovereigns, the English people fêted the Belgians in the persons of their volunteers. They visited England in the summer of 1867, and this was by no means the last of the courtesies which passed between the two nations.

The Emperor Francis Joseph having declined to visit the patron of his murdered brother, Napoleon betook himself to Salzburg, where the Austrian ruler was staying. There must have been an urgent cause which could have induced Napoleon to leave his capital in the midst of all its gaiety. The assigned cause was a visit of condolence; but an office of that sort would, under the peculiarly painful circumstances of Maximilian's death, have best been performed by deputy. The real cause was far otherwise. Finding that Prussia would have nothing to say to his designs, Napoleon thought it expedient to make terms with his old antagonist of Solferino. He did not fare better at Salzburg than he had at Paris. Returning to France, he made a speech at Lille, in which he said, "It is only weak governments which seek in foreign complications a diversion from embarrassments at home." This sounded as though the speaker, disgusted at his repeated failures in foreign affairs, was thenceforward about to devote himself to domestic reforms. Unfortunately the speech did not end there. The Emperor went on to say: "But there are black spots on the horizon; and while holding aloft the national banner, we should not allow ourselves to be drawn on by tempestuous impulses, however patriotic they may be." The phrase "black spots" was ominous, and produced so much alarm that the Emperor felt bound to explain it away, and

to make known that his visit to Salzburg had no hostile intent. To this explanation Bismarck replied in the form of a circular addressed to the Prussian ambassadors at the various courts. He adopted a very haughty tone. He said that Napoleon's explanation had not come before it was wanted. Prussia, so far from putting pressure on the South German States, had been compelled to hold them back. Henceforth she would meet those States, so far as they spontaneously wished to join the North German Confederation. Germany could not "endure the idea that the development of the affairs of the German nation should be placed under the guardianship of foreign intervention, or that of seeing them guided by other considerations than those the national interests of Germany desired." About the same time the Grand Duke of Baden, the son-in-law of the King of Prussia, opened his Parliament, and said that all his efforts would be directed to forming a union with Prussia and the North German Confederation. He added, "The first and most important natural demand is fulfilled in the defence against every foreign attack by the united powers of all under one leader."

The autumn of 1867 thus found Napoleon in no better position than he had been a year before. In fact, the position had become worse. Not only had he not obtained the territory which he had asked after the battle of Sadowa, but he had encountered a humiliating check even in his attempt to purchase that which he could not obtain as a gift. He was thus politically weaker in the eyes of Europe. On the other hand, his detested opponent, Count Bismarck, was much stronger. He had not only held his ground in North Germany, but when defied to cross the Mein, he had published far and wide the treaty which gave him the control of the largest army in Southern Germany. Moreover, Napoleon had been twice rebuffed in his attempt to get up a new alliance: once by Prussia, once by Austria. It was at this juncture that an event occurred which for a time soothed the ruffled sensibilities of the twice-baffled Emperor. Ever since the French troops had left Italian soil at Christmas of the preceding year, Italy had been in a state of ferment with respect to Rome. Garibaldi had been summoning his red-shirts to undertake a new enterprise, which should give to Italy its ancient capital. There is no need to recount the incidents of that disastrous October. Undoubtedly the Italian Government fostered the revolution at the very time that it pretended to suppress it. It is probable that Ratazzi was

beguiled by the Emperor into the belief that the Garibaldian enterprise would not be displeasing at the Tuileries. However this may be, the Italian premier forgot the advice which Napoleon gave to Cavour when about to overrun the Papal Legations—*frappez fort et frappez vite*. Ratazzi hesitated; the French clergy were furious; the Emperor could not afford to offend them with a general election only a few months off. It became necessary to protect the Holy Father. The order was given for the embarkation of French troops at Marseilles. It was countermanded, repeated, and in a few hours thousands of French soldiers were marching through the streets of Rome. Then came Mentana, a day of doom for the Garibaldians. "The chassepôt did marvels." Garibaldi was a prisoner; the Pope was safe; and Napoleon had shown to all the world that he could transport an army from one kingdom to another in twenty-four hours, and that he had a weapon which would compare with the needle-gun. It was under these circumstances that the French Chambers were opened by the Emperor on November 18, in a speech which was described as "peace and repression." In the debate on the Roman incident, M. Rouher declared that "Italy shall not seize upon Rome; France will never submit to such a violation of her honour and of Catholicity in general." "Never" is said to be "a very long time;" M. Rouher's "*jamais*" did not prove so. Two years from that time he had ceased to be "Vice-Emperor," and in less than three years the French troops were summoned home. France could no longer afford to protect the Pope, when the Crown Prince of Prussia was forcing back from the frontier the whole army of MacMahon. However, the "*jamais*" answered the two-fold purpose it was intended to serve. It reassured the alarmed *parti prêtre*, and it showed that if France was not able to have her way across the Atlantic and across the Rhine, she could lord it across the Alps.

The year 1868 opened peacefully. The *Nain Jaune* newspaper having declared "there is no place in Europe for liberty if military Prussia absorbs Germany," was threatened with suppression by the French Government. At the same time Prince Napoleon was forbidden by the Emperor to publish a political pamphlet which would have treated of the affairs of Europe. A little later he was sent on a mission to the various Continental Courts, and it was probably on this occasion that he made the suggestion attributed to him by Bismarck, for the absorption of Geneva and Piedmont into France. This was a time for negotiations, so far as foreign politics were

concerned. At home there was deep and growing discontent. France was enduring the pecuniary burdens of war without any of its compensating honour or advantages. Even the devotedly Imperial *Presse* complained of the excessive expenditure. M. Magne, who had recently been appointed Minister of Finance, admitted a deficiency of over a million sterling, and asked for a loan of £17,600,000. At this time M. Rouher was on the side of retrenchment and reform. He had serious differences with Marshal Niel. The Minister of War was for pressing on the armaments with all haste; the Minister of State was for economy. The first urged that Count von Moltke was perpetually studying on the map the shortest way to Paris; the second retorted that Marshal Niel had already discovered the shortest way to Berlin. Matters became more serious when it was discovered that Baron Haussmann had borrowed money right and left, on usurious terms, and without authority, in order to carry out his design of rebuilding the capital. It was not, however, till some months later that he was driven from office amid general rejoicing. Meanwhile M. Rouher did his best to pacify the irate Parisians by pushing the Press-law through the Chambers, in spite of the strenuous opposition of the "Arcadians." \* He also used the whole of his influence to defeat the Protectionists, who had able spokesmen in M. Thiers and in M. Pouyer-Quertier, the latter a deputy for Rouen, a city that had undoubtedly suffered by the competition of Manchester. In August the Government sustained a severe defeat by the election of M. Grévy, the Opposition candidate for the department of the Jura, who beat the Imperialist candidate by a majority of 2,000. In the following month a panic was caused on the Paris Bourse by the speech of the King of Prussia on a visit to Kiel. In December Bismarck returned to Berlin from his estate in Pomerania, where he had resided for several months in ostentatious seclusion. Ill-health was the cause assigned for his temporary retirement. It is more probable that it arose from King William's refusal to tolerate any conspiracy of the kind made known by the secret treaty published in the *Times* on July 25 of the present year. Within a few days of the Prussian Minister's return to the Prussian capital, the Marquis de Moustier was relieved of his duties, and the Marquis de la Valette was installed in the French Foreign Office. This change was ascribed to the influence of M. Rouher, whose near relative was the new Minister of War,

\* So called because they were wont to meet at a club in the Rue de l'Arcade.

and whose power was now greater than ever. It fell to the Marquis de la Valette to take an active part in settling the differences which had arisen between Greece and Turkey in consequence of the insurrection in Candia. It required urgent pressure on the part of the great powers to prevent hostilities between the long unfriendly Courts of Athens and Constantinople. A Conference was held in Paris in order to attain this result. It assembled on January 9, 1869, and on the 20th of the same month a protocol was signed, and Europe was delivered for a time from the reopening of the dangerous Eastern question.

Previously to the assembling of this Conference, the Emperor Napoleon had, on New Year's Day, according to his wont, received the members of the Diplomatic Body. Exactly ten years had passed since that memorable Jour de l'An, when he expressed to Baron Hübner his regret that the relations between Austria and France were not more cordial. That brief sentence had caused a panic throughout Europe, which was abundantly justified by the subsequent declaration of war and the campaign in Lombardy. At that time Napoleon was at the zenith of his prosperity. But the opening day of 1869 saw him in a far different position. His military prestige, though not destroyed,—that remained to be done twenty months later,—was sorely damaged. In diplomacy he had shown himself a signal blunderer. As a ruler he had not been able to establish himself in the affections of his people, though for twenty years he had governed them as President or Emperor. Nevertheless, his new year's greeting was cheerful. He said—"I am glad to testify to the conciliatory spirit which animates the different powers, and which allows difficulties to be removed where they exist. I hope that 1869 will, like 1868, remove all incentives to arms, and consolidate the peace which is so necessary to the world." A few days later, January 18th, on opening the Legislative Chambers, he made what the English newspapers declared to be by far his best speech. After declaring that the armaments of France were "henceforward on a level with its destinies in the world (a mournful prophecy if a true one), and that, therefore, France could now, without loss of honour, demand peace," the Emperor went on to say:—

"I am thoroughly resolved to persevere in the course which I have laid down, that is to say, to adopt all real progress; but also to maintain, without discussion, the fundamental basis of the Constitution, which the national vote has placed under shelter from all attacks.



'A good tree is known by its fruits,' says the Gospel. Well, if we cast a glance at the past, which is the Government that has given France seventeen years of ever-increasing prosperity? Certainly, every Government is liable to error, for Fortune does not smile upon all good enterprises; but that which constitutes my strength is the fact that the nation does not ignore that for twenty years I have not had a single thought, I have not done a single deed, of which the motive was other than the interest and the greatness of France."

This fact constituted the weakness as well as the strength of the Emperor. He had been governing France instead of allowing France to govern herself. Consequently, he had to bear the burden of every mistake. At this very time, when he was speaking of peace, the most influential journals were still harping upon the diplomatic check inflicted by Bismarck, and the *Liberté* declared that it was essential for France to extend her frontier to the Rhine, and that the war, which had been postponed in 1868, was inevitable in 1869. The assertion seemed likely enough to be verified. Scarcely had the Paris Conference settled the Eastern difficulty, when a fresh one arose close at home. The shareholders of the Grand Luxemburg Railway, which runs from Brussels to Luxemburg, had entered into negotiations for the sale of their line as far as Arlon to the French Eastern Railway Company. The negotiation becoming known, the Belgian Parliament, probably at the instigation of the Prussian Government, passed a law forbidding railway companies to make concessions of this kind without the consent of the State. Thereupon great agitation arose in Paris; at least, in the Paris journals. Seeing in this check another interposition of Bismarck's, they became exceedingly violent, and threatened Belgium with political extinction. The matter gave rise to a vast amount of diplomacy, and threatened at one time the most serious consequences. It was only through the untiring efforts of Lord Clarendon, and, as was generally believed in France, through the personal interposition of Queen Victoria, that a rupture between France and Belgium was avoided. It was not till April that the anxiety caused by this incident subsided. Shortly before the closing of the Chambers previous to the general election, the Foreign Minister declared that the policy of France was a policy of peace; and added, "A fearful responsibility would attach to whomsoever, giving way to national susceptibility, should hurl two great nations one against the other." In the same speech the Marquis de la Valette recognised the events in Germany. This address was so reassuring that our ambas-

sador, Lord Lyons, called on the Foreign Minister to thank him for it.

The session was closed on April 26th. Previously to that things had gone badly with the Government. Baron Haussmann's proceedings had become so great a scandal, that, though M. Rouher had defended him in the Chambers, the Emperor had felt bound to throw him overboard, and the great scold, refusing to resign, received his dismissal. A fierce debate had taken place on the right of interpellation, and, on a division, M. Rouher had a majority of only 12, 114 to 102; a portentous fact, remembering how absolute had been the "Vice-Emperor's" authority until then. Another cause of great dissatisfaction was the announcement made by M. Forcade de la Roquette, that the Government would retain its right to nominate official candidates at the elections. Before the dissolution of the Chambers, some rather serious disturbances had taken place in Paris, and Gustave Flourens, a clever journalist, and many other persons, had been arrested for singing the "Marseillaise." But these were only the first mutterings of the storm that broke over Paris in May and June. In that city, not only had the ministerial candidates no chance, but moderate Liberals, men of the stamp of Ollivier, the leader of the Third Party, and who even was spoken of as the future Premier—men who, at the election of 1863, had been the popular idols—now found themselves eclipsed by men like Rochefort, Raspail, Bancel, and Gambetta. Rochefort's popularity was one of the most dangerous symptoms of the day. Personally, he had not one quality to recommend him. He was unable to present himself to the electors in consequence of his having fled to Belgium to escape the penalties passed upon him for an offence against the Press-laws. His popularity arose simply and solely from his merciless attacks upon the Emperor. Week after week his pamphlet-newspaper, *La Lanterne*, had appeared full of the most stinging satire upon Napoleon and his ministers. The articles were so cleverly written, that it was some time before Rochefort got himself within the meshes of the law.

When, at last, the paper was suppressed, he published it in Brussels, and imported it by thousands; and it was circulated throughout France under the very eyes of the police, who were charged to stop it. In spite of his popularity, however, Rochefort did not get elected deputy for Paris either in the primary election of May 23, or the supplementary one of June 6. He, however, obtained a seat during the ensuing

summer, and became the most prominent man in the Empire. He soon showed that he was not born to be a revolutionary leader. His courage failed when he was placed at the head of a great republican demonstration, and from that time his popularity rapidly waned. A little later he was tried for another political offence, and his consignment to prison for several months excited little notice. The net result of the elections in May and June was that Paris gave a "Red" vote, and both there and in other important cities moderate Liberals had almost as little a chance of election as Ministerialists. The capital declared itself irreconcilably hostile to the Empire, and the successful candidates avowed their intention of taking the oath of allegiance to the Emperor, only in order that they might be in a better position to overthrow the Government. The total number of Opposition candidates elected, including dynastic Liberals and Irreconcilables, was about ninety-five, an enormous increase as compared with the elections of 1863.\* The riots did not end with the elections. The second week of June witnessed most serious disturbances, the mob, on one occasion, attempting to form a barricade. It became necessary for the troops to disperse the rioters. The Liberal party ascribed these disturbances to the Government, which they said wished to discredit the party with the country, and to frighten Paris with visions of Red Republican risings. There is reason to believe that the charge was well founded. Certainly, the Liberal journals did their utmost to prevent these disturbances. Simultaneously with these manifestations in Paris, there were serious riots at St. Etienne, and in the conflict that took place between the miners and the soldiery about a dozen of the first were killed.

On Monday, June 28, the members of the new Corps Législatif assembled for the first time. M. Rouher made a speech which was considered to intimate that the Government would not withhold moderate reforms. On the same day, the various sections of the Liberal party met and agreed upon a common course of action. They determined upon making the following motion: "We ask to interpellate the Government on the necessity of giving satisfaction to the wishes of the country, and of associating it more efficaciously in the direction of affairs." It was anticipated that 110 members would support this resolution, and the position of the Ministry was considered so critical that the Paris correspondent of the

\* The ballot showed that, whereas in 1863 the Government received 5,150,000 votes, and the Liberals 1,660,000, in 1869 the numbers were 4,440,000 and 3,320,000.

*Times* declared the days of personal government were numbered. In order to rescue the Ministers, some of the Imperialists themselves came forward and proposed reforms; but the diversion altogether failed. On July 12, M. Rouher delivered, with a pale face and a tremulous voice, an important message to the Corps Législatif from the Emperor. It announced that the Senate would be convoked as soon as possible to consider various reforms, having for their object the conferring greater freedom and power upon the Chamber, both with regard to debates and the budget, the empowering of Ministers to sit as deputies, and the establishment of closer relations between the Chamber and the Government. The Emperor added, "I have already shown several times how much I am disposed to relinquish in the public interest certain of my prerogatives. The modifications which I have decided to propose constitute the natural development of those which have successively been made in the institutions of the Empire. They must, at the same time, leave intact the prerogatives which the people have most explicitly confided to me, and which are the essential condition of power and of the preservation of order in society." This important communication was followed, a few hours later, by the resignation of M. Rouher, and by the prorogation of the Corps Legislatif. The last incident called forth a vehement, but ineffectual, protest from Jules Favre. The situation elicited from Thiers a clever jest. A deputy observed to him, "Well, Liberty is brought to bed at last." "Yes," was the historian's reply, "but it is by a Cæsarian operation." With the fall of M. Rouher fell the Ministry of State. Henceforward ministers were to be responsible chiefs of departments. The "Vice-Emperor" was not left without a reward for all his devotion—he was made President of the Senate. In the new Ministry, the Marquis de la Valette and the Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne exchanged places, the first leaving the Foreign Office for the Embassy in London, which had been held by the second. Proposals were made to the chiefs of the *Tiers Parti*, with Ollivier at their head, to take office, but they refused to do so, justly deeming that the infusion of the old personal government was still far too strong. The result proved the correctness of their surmise. M. Focrade de la Roquette, the Minister of the Interior, was merely M. Rouher "writ large."

In accordance with the law, changes like those announced by M. Rouher had to be submitted to the Senate; and so while the Chamber of Deputies was closed, to the exasperation of the members, the Senate assembled on August 2 in order

to consider the *Senatus Consultum*, which embodied the proposed alterations. On August 15, the Imperial Fête-day, and the centenary of the First Napoleon's birth, an amnesty for political offences was proclaimed, and produced a favourable but short-lived impression. Other events effaced it. The death of Marshal Niel, the prolonged prorogation of the Corps Législatif, and the serious illness of the Emperor, followed each other in rapid succession. Great as was the agitation caused on the Bourse by the last event, the absence of regret was painfully conspicuous. There was something almost brutal in the conduct of the Opposition press towards the sick Emperor. It seemed to gloat over his sufferings, and to feel his failing pulse and watch his pallid face with noisy glee. It was indeed a sad comment upon personal government: the government which had insisted upon doing everything for the nation, and allowing the nation to do nothing for itself. Prince Napoleon, who more than once showed himself much better able than his cousin to discern the signs of the times, did not fail at this juncture to urge the Emperor to greater concessions. He caused consternation in the Senate by a bold speech, which he delivered on September 1. He told the Emperor that he could do everything with bayonets but sit upon them. He was especially emphatic in condemning the large powers possessed by the Senate, a nominated body, and called it a convention in the presence of Cæsar. In the same debate, M. Chevalier made an earnest appeal to the Senate to profit by the example of England, and grant a real parliamentary government. On September 10 the decree promulgating the *Senatus Consultum* was published in the *Journal Officiel*. The good effect which might have been produced by the programme of reforms was neutralised by the absence of all reference to the re-summoning of the Corps Législatif. The Chamber should have been summoned, at the very latest, on October 26, in order to complete the verification of the more than fifty elections which remained to be verified when the sudden prorogation of July 16 took place. But as time passed on, and no summons was issued, the extreme Radicals threatened to present themselves *en masse* at the doors of the Palais Bourbon on the 26th, and demand admission. Fortunately for the peace of Paris the more moderate Liberals issued, on October 18, a manifesto, in which they announced that they should abstain from taking any part in this demonstration, because it would only give the Government another opportunity of injuring true freedom under the pretence of suppressing a riot. Thus the dreaded

day passed by without tumult. Another serious crisis was close at hand. Several of the most eminent Liberals had been elected for more than one constituency, and thus fresh elections became necessary for certain constituencies. Some of these were in Paris, and once more Rochefort offered himself. Having been included in the amnesty of August 15, he was able to present himself before the electors. His success was assured from the outset. On November 29 the Chambers were once more opened, and the Emperor delivered a long and important address. He began by the assertion, that "It is not easy to establish in France the regular and peaceful exercise of liberty." He next referred to the disorders of the summer and autumn, and added: "France desires liberty, but liberty united with order; for order I will answer:—aid me, gentlemen, to save liberty; and to attain this object, let us keep at an equal distance from reaction and revolutionary theories." He then referred to the *Senatus Consultum*, and mentioned the various measures which had been recommended. Adverting to foreign affairs, he found everything *couleur de rose*. He concluded with an exhortation to unity, whereby the excesses of revolutionary passions might be prevented. This speech produced an unfavourable impression upon the Liberal party. They were not, however, united; and Ollivier, who had been their chief, entered into negotiations with the Emperor. On December 8 it was announced that the Ministry had resigned. A prolonged ministerial crisis ensued, and lasted until the 27th. On that day the Emperor wrote to Ollivier the following letter:—

"SIR,—The Ministers having given in their resignation, I address myself with confidence to your patriotism, in order to request you will designate the persons who can, in conjunction with yourself, form a homogeneous cabinet faithfully representing the majority of the Legislative Body, and resolved to carry out, in the letter as well as in the spirit, the *Senatus Consultum* of the 8th September. I rely upon the devotion of the Legislative Body to the great interests of the country, as well as upon yours, to aid me in the task I have undertaken to bring into regular working a constitutional system."

This letter was generally regarded as the commencement of the era of parliamentary government. On the third day of the new year (1870) the *Journal Officiel* announced the names of the new Ministers. Ollivier, Minister of Justice; Count Daru, Foreign Minister; Chevandier de Valdrome, Interior; Buffet, Finance; General Lebœuf, War; Admiral Rigault de



Genouilly, Marine; Ségris, Public Instruction; Talhouet, Public Works; Louvet, Commerce; Marshal Vaillant, Imperial Household; Richard, Fine Arts. Receiving the Legislative Body on New Year's Day, the Emperor said he was like a traveller who relieved himself of a portion of his burden in order to arrive more quickly at his destination. That was, prosperity securely guaranteed, and liberty definitively established. On the 10th, the new Ministry met the Chambers, and Ollivier, in the Corps Législatif, asked, amid great cheering, for the confidence of that body in his endeavours to secure the realisation of progress without violence, and liberty without revolution. It was just at this juncture, when the Emperor hoped he had reconciled the Parisians to himself, that a great disaster occurred. A young journalist, Salmon by name, but calling himself Victor Noir, called upon Prince Pierre Bonaparte, a cousin of the Emperor, and a man of violent temper, in order to reply to a challenge which the Prince had sent to M. Rochefort for having insulted the Bonapartes in his new paper, the *Marseillaise*. High words ensued, and the Prince shot Salmon dead, and fired at his companion, Fonvielle. The Emperor was greatly affected on hearing of this catastrophe. Prince Pierre was arrested, and in due time tried, but escaped serious punishment. Meanwhile the incident gave rise to the most violent agitation in Paris. The funeral of the victim was attended by nearly 15,000 persons. Rochefort published the most violent articles in the *Marseillaise*; and, in spite of his position as a Deputy, he was prosecuted for them, and sentenced to imprisonment. Almost simultaneously with this disturbed state of feeling in the capital, there occurred a strike of 10,000 workmen at the ironworks of Creuzot, which led to serious complications.

The early part of February saw some very grave disturbances in Paris. Attempts were made in several parts of the city to erect barricades, and several collisions took place between the people and the military and police. As days passed, the position of the Ollivier Cabinet became increasingly difficult. Full liberty had been given to the press, and, on the faith of it, Republican journals, like the *Marseillaise*, the *Rappel*, and the *Reveil*, were published. But the Government worried the proprietors and the editors with perpetual prosecutions, and thereby exposed themselves to the taunt of having forsaken their principles. Another cause of grievance existed in the fact, that the Ministry refused to sanction a dissolution of the Chambers and a fresh election. It was

proved on incontrovertible evidence that Government *employés*, the *préfets maires*, and the like, had most scandalously interfered with the elections, and that a large number of official candidates owed their seats to wholesale promises of Government concessions for local improvements. A very animated debate on this point was raised by M. Jules Favre; but as the official candidates, however little disposed to support a Liberal Ministry on ordinary occasions, were for motives of self-preservation bound to support them on the present, Ollivier and his colleagues obtained a very large majority. At the same time the Ministers intimated that there would be no official candidates in future. This last declaration was hailed by the Moderate Liberals with delight; but it dismayed the Arcadians. M. Clément Duvernois, he who was to be the agent of Ollivier's downfall on the memorable August 9th, denounced that Minister most vehemently in the Emperor's own organ, the *Peuple Français*. Nevertheless, the Ollivier Ministry had decidedly improved in popular favour; and at the end of February seemed destined to a prolonged existence. On March 22nd, the Emperor addressed to the Premier a letter, in which he expressed his desire to divide the legislative power between the two Chambers, and to restore to the nation that portion of constituent power it had delegated to him. The letter spoke of the constitutional changes which had been effected, and the desirability of completing them. To that end Ollivier was directed to prepare the necessary *Senatus Consultum*, the Senate alone having power to make changes in the Constitution. This letter was at first received with the most lively satisfaction; but that emotion became greatly changed when it was found that the Emperor refused to give up his right of appealing to the people by a plébiscite. As M. About remarked, this was the *coup d'état en permanence*. M. Thiers, who had been giving the Government his powerful support of late, declared that the plébiscite was a Cæsarian manner of acting, and full of danger. It soon became known that the Emperor not only insisted upon retaining this power, but intended to use it. This resolve led to the resignation of Count Daru, the ablest member of the Ministry, and his example was followed by MM. Talhouet and Buffet. The first was succeeded at the Foreign Office, after an interregnum, during which Ollivier held the foreign seal, by the Duke of Gramont, and his appointment at once led experienced politicians to fear that the Emperor meant to show himself unfriendly to Prussia. A few days latter, on April 23rd, the decree, announcing the plébiscite, was published in the

*Journal Officiel*. Immediately afterwards Paris was startled by the news of a conspiracy against the Emperor's life. The Liberals of the Left and the Irreconcilables denounced the discovery as a fiction, devised for the purpose of influencing the plébiscite. Certainly it was turned to good account. The *Figaro* published an engraving of the bomb which had been destined for the Emperor's destruction, and a most sensational account of the *complot* was posted throughout the provinces. In the rural districts the story was believed; in the large towns it was disbelieved. Even some of these, however,—namely, Strasburg, Rheims, Douai, Dunkerque, Valenciennes, Roubaix, Mulhouse, Amiens, and Versailles, voted *Oui*; and although in Paris there was an enormous majority against the Emperor, there was a gain of 50,000 votes in his favour as compared with the last occasion upon which he had tested the popular feeling. The net result was that while about 1,500,000 voted against him, 7,250,000 voted in his favour. That he obtained so many votes was doubtless due to the fear of a new "Red" régime, which was openly advocated in Rochefort's *Marseillaise* and kindred journals. Altogether, the Emperor had reason to consider May 8th a day of victory. There was one rather ominous circumstance—40,000 soldiers voted against him. This fact, doubtless, had some share in the terrible events that were impending. The Emperor, in announcing at the Tuileries the result of the plébiscite, made a moderate and modest speech; but he could not neutralise the mischief which he had done in relaxing the springs of the new Constitutional Government by a wholly unconstitutional proceeding. One result of the plébiscite was that the Liberal leaders saw the necessity of re-constituting their party, and repudiating all connection with the revolutionists. M. Picard called a meeting in order to form a Constitutional Opposition, "the right wing of the army of the Left," as he happily called it. Even M. Gambetta, while declaring himself as irreconcilable as ever, denounced "violence, émeutes, and plots." He said that assassins, whoever they may be, should be given up to the rigour of the law.

But the time was at hand when neither the negotiations of the different sections of the Liberal party, nor the Emperor's attempts to reconcile constitutional and personal government, would attract notice. At the outset of this article, we described the sudden appearance of the Hohenzollern incident, and the momentous events to which it gave rise, down to the commencement of hostilities: the events which followed are

among the most startling ever recorded, even in French history.

Thus far had we written in the early days of August. Even at that date things were going so ill with France that we did not hesitate to place at the head of this article the title which now stands there. "The Fall of the Second Empire" was then prophecy: it is now history. We must briefly record the events which led up to the stupendous catastrophe, a "catastrophe" far different from that wherewith the Duke of Gramont threatened Baron Werther on July 4.

War was announced, as we have already seen, on July 15; yet it was not till nearly a fortnight later that the Emperor set out with his son for the Imperial head-quarters at Metz. M. Rouher had openly declared that his master was ready. Marshal Le Bœuf had said privately that France was ready, as she had never been ready before—as she never would be ready again; and when questioned what he meant by that word "ready," had said, that if the war was continued for a year the army would not want a button. It was these confident announcements which had induced the peace-loving Ollivier to throw aside all his convictions, and to give the lie to his whole policy and career, by recording his casting vote for war when the Ministers were found to be equally divided. But this delay did not look like readiness. In Germany there was surprise, in France impatience. General Moltke declared that if the French did not cross the Rhine before the end of July they would never cross it. In Germany, where war had not been contemplated, everything had to be prepared; and while train after train, filled with troops, was tearing to the frontier, a little band of men, but a few hundreds in number, guarded that frontier, burnt numerous fires at night, and made the French believe that they had a whole *corps d'armée* before them. Even when the Emperor did at last arrive at Metz, July 28, he remained inactive. On the 29th he issued an address to the army which was hardly calculated to inspire it with confidence, and resembled a speech on the troubles of matrimony at a wedding-breakfast. The soldiers were told that they were going to fight against one of the best armies in Europe; that the war then commencing would be long and severe; that fortresses and obstacles stood in their way: but, added the Emperor, with singular ill-judgment, nothing could withstand the valour of the troops who had fought in Italy, China, and Mexico. It was, moreover, somewhat venturesome to declare that the fate of liberty and civilisation depended upon

the success of an army that had been recruited with the wild Arabs of Algeria. At last impatience—the impatience of the stay-at-homes in Paris, if not of the army at Metz—became so great that it was absolutely necessary for the Emperor to strike a blow; so on the morning of August 2 he and his son took the train to Saarbrück, as though they were going to a picnic, and the mitrailleuses made their hoarse roar heard for the first time. The fourteen-years'-old Prince fired off the first of these new inventions devised to improve mankind off the face of the earth. The soldiers went into theatrical raptures over this achievement of the heir to the founder of the Empire which is peace. "Louis has received his baptism of fire," telegraphed the proud father to the anxious mother. Father and son returned to Metz to dinner. They had fought together, and won their first victory over a few hundred men in an open town. It was to be their last. Two days later, August 4, Napoleon was presiding at Metz over a council of war, at which MacMahon and Bazaine were present. While they were discussing plans that ought to have been arranged and put in force a week before, the Crown Prince of Prussia fell upon a portion of MacMahon's corps at the little frontier town of Wissemburg. MacMahon was surprised, as he and his fellow-commanders were always destined to be throughout the war. His troops fought splendidly; they had not yet become demoralised by constant mismanagement and reverses; but they were cruelly outnumbered, and the Crown Prince was able to boast the first real triumph of the campaign. As in 1866, so in 1870, it was Moltke's tactics to strike rapidly, and to allow the enemy no time to recover from defeat. On August 6, the Crown Prince again attacked MacMahon on the hills above Woerth. Simultaneously Frossard's corps was attacked on the heights above Saarbrück. MacMahon fought like a lion. Frossard, who had been the tutor of the Prince Impérial, remained at dinner during the greater part of the engagement. General De Failly, the hero of Mentana, who should have held a position between the two armies, retreated, and was not heard of for a fortnight. Both MacMahon and Frossard were utterly beaten, the first with the loss of 6,000 men, thirty guns, six mitrailleuses, and two eagles. This was sorry news to send to Paris; nevertheless it *was* sent. The policy of deliberate mystification and falsehood had not yet come to be thought necessary to save the dynasty. The blow was terrible; all the more so, because false tidings, begotten on the Bourse, had been circulating in the capital that a great victory had been won, and that the Crown Prince

was a prisoner. All day Saturday the people waited for confirmation of the news. The flags which had been hung out in honour of Tuesday's "victory of Saarbrück," remained displayed in honour of the greater victory that was to be announced. Far other news reached the Parisians. On that "sad Sunday" came the Emperor's message to the Empress. "We have sustained a check; the position is grave; but *tout peut se rétablir*." Other messages attempted to find consolation in the fact that the enemy had not been able to pursue the flying French army. It was an army no more. It was severed, never more to reunite. It was only by degrees that the full height of the disaster became clear. But enough was apparent at once to make it evident that France must now be prepared to act on the defensive, and to see her own territory invaded by the men whom she had hoped to drive before her into Berlin.

The Parisians were not slow to answer the question "Whom shall we hang?" The Ollivier Ministry issued a tumid address, saying, "Let the whole people rise, quivering and sworn to fight the great fight." The Empress issued another address. Paris was declared in a state of siege. But neither addresses nor declarations could save the Ollivier Ministry. On August 9 communications respecting the military position were made in the Senate and the Corps Législatif. When the words "in the name of the Emperor" were read, the Deputies in the Lower Chamber shouted "Enough." Jules Favre demanded the recall of Napoleon from the command of the army. De Kératry moved his abdication. Then ensued a terrible storm, Paul Cassagnac shouting through the uproar that the members of the Left ought to be shot. Clément Duvernois, a parasite of the Emperor, moved a resolution, that "the Chamber being determined to support a cabinet capable of organising the defence of the country, passes to the order of the day." Ollivier declared that he could not accept the motion. It was carried, however. Ollivier begged for an adjournment, and on reassembling announced the resignation of his colleagues and himself. Thus within less than a month the Minister who declared that he went to war "with a light heart" was hurled from power. Outside the Chamber an alarming scene was taking place. A vast crowd had assembled before the Palais Bourbon. The cavalry called upon the people to disperse, and meeting with a refusal, charged them. The National Guard refused to act against the people. On the same night a new ministry was announced. General Montauban, Count of Palikao, was chosen War Minister and



Premier. He was a man of indifferent reputation, and had enriched himself by indiscriminate looting in China during the war with that country. He associated with himself no less a person than Baron Jerome David, the most reactionary of politicians. It is not necessary to mention all the names of a ministry that was destined to endure for only six-and-twenty days.

If so short-lived a government deserves a title, it will be known as the Lying Ministry. During its brief existence it systematically and continuously deceived the country with false news. That was not its only characteristic. It dealt most rigorously with the press, not only forbidding the publication of the democratic journals, like the *Marseillaise* and the *Rappel*,—a step pardonable under the circumstances in which Paris then found itself,—but also forbade all other journals to publish any news at all except that contained in the *Journal Officiel*. This was either most meagre or was altogether false. The fatal severance of the French army on the disastrous 6th was always on the point of being repaired. The series of battles fought before Metz, on the 14th, 16th, and 18th of August, and which the King of Prussia has named Courcelles, Mars-la-Tour, and Gravelotte, were represented as French victories, although it was plain on the face of them that Bazaine, instead of escaping from Metz, was driven back within it. The battle of Gravelotte, or Rezonville, as it was at first called, the third of the triad fought in the third week of August, was one of the most bloody in all history. It was destined to be eclipsed by another still more bloody a fortnight later. Before it took place, in fact before the first of the three was fought, Napoleon left Metz, which he had entered as commander-in-chief only seventeen days before. He took with him his son. They were nearly captured by the ubiquitous and audacious Uhlans. History will record how the two had to travel in a third-class railway-carriage, glad to drink sour wine out of a cracked glass; and how, when they had got safely to their temporary destination, the Imperial baggage, contained in thirty waggons, was sent after them, and the wearied and famished soldiers, who had to stop to let them pass, broke open the supply waggons, and helped themselves to their contents. The army had for some time become demoralised. Incessantly taken unawares, constantly short of food and munitions, everywhere outnumbered and out-generalled, it had lost all confidence in its officers, and believed itself betrayed. The peasants, whose votes had been given for the Emperor with such

unanimity three months before, asked themselves, with amazement and dismay, if this never-ending swarm of Germans was the result of the plébiscite; if it was in order to have their crops destroyed and their homes broken up that they had obeyed the bidding of their maires, and voted *Oui*. In Paris, by common consent, the Emperor was never spoken of. It was universally held certain that he would not return, and everyone made their plans without thought of him. The Empress was still nominally regent, but the real power was entrusted to Count Palikao, the War Minister and Premier, and to General Trochu, who was charged with the defence of Paris. It was to Palikao that the next and most disastrous move in the campaign was due. MacMahon seeing that, separated from Bazaine, he had no chance of making head against the enemy, was for falling back upon Paris, in order to gain time for reorganising his most inefficient army. With that object he broke up the camp at Chalons, where the troops were almost on the verge of mutiny, so great was their exasperation against the Emperor. This camp had long been the pride of France. It was looked upon as offering an almost invincible defence in the improbable event of an invader ever penetrating so far. Yet it was abandoned without striking a blow, and the vast town of huts was burnt to the ground. MacMahon was prepared to make this great sacrifice in order to save his army. But he was not permitted to save it. He was ordered to advance instead of falling back; to save Bazaine instead of himself. He remonstrated, but Count Palikao insisted, and thereupon the gallant soldier obeyed, as he had obeyed at Woerth, though he knew that obedience was fatal. Then on the closing days of August came the end. Simultaneously, no doubt by concert, Bazaine endeavoured to force his way out of Metz through the army of Prince Frederick Charles, and MacMahon endeavoured to cross the Meuse, and falling upon the Prince's rear, place him between two fires, and effect a junction with the beleaguered army on the Moselle. Both efforts failed. For three days MacMahon fought with splendid courage. On the morning of the third day, September 1st, he was grievously wounded. He had to transfer the command to General Wimpffen, who had but just arrived from Algeria, and who knew nothing of his predecessor's plan. Probably there never was in the world's history so frightful a carnage as took place around and in the little fortress-town of Sedan during those fearful three days. Napoleon, it is averred by German witnesses, fought in person, though so great an in-

valid that he could scarcely sit on a horse. He fought as though he invited death. But death came not to him, the author of a hundred thousand deaths. He would have cut his way through the Bavarian troops into Belgium, but the fire of the artillery was too hot to be endured. A shell burst close to him and killed the officer near him. In Sedan, "hell was let loose," so said the doomed inmates. At last, after some altercation with General Wimpffen, the Emperor sent a flag of truce and a letter to King William, saying, that not being able to die at the head of his army, he laid his sword at the feet of his Majesty. The interviews that followed with Bismarck, and then with the King, there is no need to describe here. Every incident of them is graven on our minds. August 2nd had seen young Louis' baptism of fire, September 2nd saw the Emperor a prisoner discredited, seeking for mercy at the hands of the Sovereign whom, three years before, he had received amid the splendours of the most magnificent Court in the world. It is useless to moralise over such a change of fortune as this. No words will point that moral or adorn that tale. Napoleon was conveyed through Belgium, the country he had meant to annex, to the prison assigned for him, the Castle of Wilhelmshöhe, where his uncle, Jerome, had passed many days of pleasure when King of Westphalia. There the captive nephew has been established, surrounded with comfort, and even with luxury; treated still as a sovereign person, and waiting for the next scene in the strange drama of his life.

It was impossible that the stupendous events of September 1st and 2nd should be long kept from Paris. The surrender of an army of 150,000 men, with the Sovereign who ruled it, is an event without precedent in modern history. It had to be "broken" to the Parisians by the Ministers who, during their brief term of office, had been kindling false hopes only to be thus terribly crushed. On Friday, September 2nd, it was reported that MacMahon, who had lost ground on the 30th, had recovered it on the 31st, and there was reason to hope for the best. But on Saturday, September 3rd, Count Palikao, looking greatly cast down, had to tell a very different tale to the Corps Législatif. Bazaine had failed to escape from his imprisonment at Metz; MacMahon had been defeated on the Meuse, a portion of his army had been compelled to retreat to Sedan, and some troops had been driven into Belgium. There were rumours of even more serious disasters; but the Government had no official information of them, and it would not alarm the country by

further allusion to these reports. This was but a very small portion of the story which the Minister would have to tell: it was only a line of the scroll which he would have to unfold, written within and without with lamentation, mourning, and woe. Yet it sufficed to arouse the strongest alarms. M. Jules Favre mounted the tribune, and said that the time was come to speak the truth. The conduct of the army had been heroic. But the *de facto* Government ought to be declared at an end. It was not from this Government that the nation could expect the power necessary to save itself. The nation must, henceforth, rely upon itself alone. It was only by liberty that France could conquer. Hitherto liberty had been wanting. Now they must take it, and not concern themselves any further about the Government. "For myself," concluded M. Favre, "I do not fear to say that I appeal to my country, and I trust my country will hear me." The words caused profound excitement, which the Minister's hesitating reply could not allay. Out of doors, the evil tidings which he had communicated to the Deputies soon got noised abroad. Tremendous crowds thronged the Boulevards that evening. Shouts of "*Déchéance!*" were heard, and the police made no attempt to arrest the shouters. It was a most critical position. No one could tell from minute to minute if Paris would not witness once more a bloody revolution. A crowd gathered round the house of General Trochu, and called upon him to proclaim the dethronement. He expressed to the people his intense sorrow at the news of a "disaster unheard of in history." "But," said he, "I am a soldier. I have taken an oath. I should dishonour myself were I not to keep it. The Chamber alone can do what you want. I have no powers but those vested in me to organise the national defence." "You will soon have greater powers," shouted the crowd; and they moved on towards the Corps Législatif. There they were received by Gambetta. He stood upon the steps of the Palais Bourbon and addressed the people. He implored them to show to the nation that revolution and patriotism were synonymous terms. "Paris at the present moment holds in its hands not only the fate of the country, but the fate of the French revolution." Then, on shouts of "*Déchéance!*" being raised he said, that within six hours the Chambers would take "a manly resolve worthy of a free people." Finally, he urged the crowd to withdraw, as "it was not seemly that the Chambers should deliberate under pressure from without." His advice was followed; and though, at one time, there was the most imminent risk

of a collision between the mob and the *sergents-de-ville*, Paris went to bed without bloodshed. That it would be equally fortunate on the morrow was more than anyone could venture to say. Everything depended upon the course which would be taken by the leaders of the Left.

While the Parisians slumbered and slept, the Corps Législatif held an extraordinary sitting. What a Sunday's sitting of the House of Commons would be to England—an event implying a great national crisis—that a midnight sitting of the Corps Législatif is to France. At this sitting, Count Palikao informed the house officially of what had taken place at Sedan. Thereupon, Jules Favre brought forward a three-fold resolution, signed by himself and twenty-six other deputies. "1st. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and his dynasty are proclaimed to have forfeited the powers conferred upon them by the Constitution. 2nd. An Executive Commission (the number of members to be subsequently decided on) will be appointed by the Corps Législatif, for the express purpose of driving the enemy from the soil of France. 3rd. General Trochu is maintained in his post as Governor of Paris." M. Pinard, an old and devoted Imperialist, was the only member in all that Chamber, packed though it was with official candidates, who raised any objection to this motion. The objection was based on technical grounds. But the time was not one when technicalities would be allowed to prevail. The Chambers adjourned until a later hour of the same day, September 4th.

The first thing which met the eyes of the Parisians on that Sunday morning was the announcement affixed to the walls, and signed by all the Ministers, informing the city that MacMahon had capitulated with all his army, and that the Emperor was a prisoner. This news was worse than the worst which had been feared. There was a rush for the papers. But Count Palikao's *régime* was not yet over, and the journals contained no particulars. M. Picard's paper, the *Electeur Libre*, contained a report of the night's sitting of the Corps Législatif, and it at once became apparent that the Palais Bourbon would be the scene of decisive events. It was announced that the Chamber would meet at noon. An hour before that time the Boulevards, which had worn an air of desertion, suddenly became thronged. Troops of the National Guard, probably not without previous intimation, marched, followed by a vast concourse of people, to the Place de la Concorde. Neither the people, nor the Guard, were silent. They both raised the same cries: "*La Déchéance!*"

"*Vive la République!*" As each successive battalion of the National Guard defiled into the Place, it was received with shouts of approbation. Often an entire battalion raised the butt-ends of their muskets in the air in token of sympathy with the crowd. Just about this time the Imperial flag was lowered at the Tuileries, and for the last time. The Empress-Regent had left the famous palace during the night; not a day too soon. Escorted by Ferdinand de Lesseps, the projector of the Suez Canal, she arrived in England—at Ryde—travel-stained, weary, and dejected. A little later she rejoined her son, who had reached Hastings from Belgium a few hours before. While the crowd, now increasing in density, waited in that splendid square, which has been called the centre of the world, a debate was proceeding in the Corps Législatif upon Jules Favre's motion. The Ministry opposed it, and offered, as an alternative, a proposition that a Council of Defence, consisting of five members, should be named by the Chamber, the Ministers to be nominated by the Council, and Palikao to be made Lieutenant-General. The proposition met with scarcely any support; and M. Thiers made a third proposal, to the effect that a Commission of Government and National Defence should be immediately formed by the Chamber, and a Constituent Assembly convoked as soon as circumstances permitted. It was decided to refer all three propositions to the bureaux, and the sitting was suspended for twenty minutes. During the adjournment, the crowd, grown impatient, forced their way into the Chamber, shouting "*Vive la République!*" In vain did the President ring his bell, in vain did Gambetta implore the people to respect the freedom of the Chamber. The tumult continued, and the sitting was declared at an end. It does not appear if the dethronement was formally put to the Chamber. But a little later some six or eight names were fixed upon for a Provisional Government. The Ministers, thus chosen by themselves, adjourned to the Hôtel de Ville, and there constituted themselves a Government, and allotted the various offices of State. In the course of the evening, a placard announced to the "citizens" of Paris that the Republic had been "proclaimed," and the Government "acclaimed," and that the latter consisted of Jules Favre, Jules Ferry, Jules Simon, Emmanuel Arago, Crémieux, Gambetta, Garnier-Pagés, Glais-Bizoin, Pelletan, Picard, and Rochefort. The last was still in the political prison of St. Pélagie. But a detachment of the Paris crowd found no difficulty in persuading the governor of the prison to release him.



Thus fell the Second Empire, unhonoured, unwept. "When the wicked perish there is shouting," saith Scripture, and the saying is true of bad institutions no less than of bad men. On that remarkable Sunday "Paris was *en fête*." One of its armies was shut up in a fortress, another had laid down its arms to the enemy, the hugest capitulation that the world had ever seen. Death had invaded countless homes; shame had befallen the whole country; the victorious enemy was advancing with irresistible impetus upon Paris; yet "Paris was *en fête*!" So great was the joy at the overthrow of the Empire, that danger, disaster, and death, were all forgotten, and the Parisians clasped eager hands, and raised loud songs of triumph, as though they had won a mighty victory.

The Empire had fallen. For nineteen years its chief had been endeavouring to govern France instead of allowing France to govern herself. Nor, it must be admitted, was the attempt altogether without good results. The Emperor had occasionally been ahead of the nation. He had conferred upon France the benefits of free-trade in spite of herself. He had overcome that international antagonism which had for so many centuries kept the two Westernmost Powers estranged. He had covered France with many splendid and useful works, which served not only to her adornment, but also to the development of her resources. Yet, when the "Balance of the Empire" comes to be struck in what has been called by the Paris *Liberté* the "black-book," we shall find it heavily on the wrong side, even without taking account of that last and fatal entry, the iniquitous Franco-German war. Napoleon, years ago, declared at Bordeaux, *l'Empire c'est la paix*; but the bitter witticism that was uttered then, *l'Empire c'est l'épée*, has proved only too well justified. Even when not engaged in actual warfare, France has been a huge camp, keeping Europe in a state of perpetual apprehension, and compelling the maintenance of huge standing armies and "bloated armaments." It may be, that in this respect the Third Republic will be no improvement upon the Second Empire, for republics in France have been ever warlike. But, at least, the new *régime* will do what the old would not—it will suffer the people to have a free voice in their own government. The last great Imperial act of domestic politics was the plébiscite, that appeal to the ignorant classes manipulated by Imperial officials. One of the first acts of the Republic has been to announce the summoning of a Con-

stituent Assembly, which will be elected freely and without corruption, and which will, for the first time since the *coup d'état*, faithfully represent the people. It was a bold announcement to make at such a crisis. But the boldest course is sometimes the most prudent. It was imperative that the French rulers should, at the earliest possible moment, repudiate the *régime* which, inaugurated by the massacre of December 2nd, has fallen in the rout of September 2nd.

---

ART. III.—1. *Rapport sur l'Hygiène de l'Armée Française : 1. Dans la Crimée ; 2° dans la Guerre d'Italie.* Par le DOCTEUR CHENU, Chef de la Service Médicale. Paris : 1868 and 1870.

2. *Report of the American Health Commission during the War of 1867.* By J. HAMMOND, M.D. New York : 1869.

Of late years a great deal has been done for the soldier which it never entered into the hearts of our grandfathers to think of as necessary or even desirable. A good deal of this has been matter of mere economy. It is cheaper to take care of your men than to waste them as our West India regiments used to be wasted. Every soldier in his second year of service represents so much hard cash that, when there is exceptional mortality, as now and then in the Mauritius or the Bermudas, or here and there in India (all the more, seemingly, since the costly barracks with their upper storeys were built), the loss is sensibly felt in the budget. People used not to mind this. In Sir Walter Scott's highly sensational story, the "Surgeon's Daughter," there is a plain unexaggerated account of the horrors which the East India Company's recruits had to endure before they reached their destination. Things were never so bad as that in the Queen's service ; but even in it there was a recklessness of life which to us seems strange, and which (if we may judge by what the most go-ahead nation in the world has done in the way of caring for the soldiers) will soon be absolutely incomprehensible. We shall learn of our American cousins in this, as we have learnt of them in other things. It is no more to our discredit to borrow hints as to military hygiene than to adopt sewing-machines and lawn-mowers. We might think the hints were to be got nearer home. France was, before this wretched war, believed to be the paradise of the soldier : he travels, whether by rail or diligence, in uniform or in mufti, whether on State business or in search of *bonnes fortunes*, at a quarter the fare which civilians have to pay ; he gets unadulterated Government tobacco at half the market price ; he is petted in every conceivable way ; and yet M. Chenu, the chief army doctor, in his report (published last year) of the health, &c., of the army during the Italian campaign of 1859 and '60, draws sad contrasts between France and America, and shows that (as far as doctoring goes) the soldier is far better off on the

other side of the Atlantic than he is among our neighbours across the Channel. It is worth while to put down a few of his facts in illustration of what must be, as long as there are any wars, a most important subject; for very few of us realise the immense loss which armies suffer in war time from insufficient medical appliances. We have heard a great deal about the losses in the different campaigns of modern times. Every battle has been reckoned up and set in its proper place in the ghastly list. Thus it appears that, out of the 1,800,000 who have been killed off by war between 1853 and 1866, America has lost 800,000 and France 120,000. And, despite this difference, France grumbles a great deal,—and by her grumbling put a premature stop to both the Crimean and the Mexican wars,—because (she argues) her soldiers are not mercenaries, like the Irish and Germans in the States' armies, or like the French army under the old régime, but represent something much more than their mere money value, being, as they are, the young life-blood of the nation.

Dr. Chenu's two works—this on Italy and a former one on the medical service during the Crimean war—give a complete account of the status of the French soldier during these two campaigns. Its completeness may be judged of from the fact that, for the Crimean war, eighteen non-commissioned officers, working during ten months, have alphabetically arranged 1,150,000 "cases," giving the patients' names, age, birth-place, rank, &c., the nature of the casualty, the treatment, and the result. Here is a storehouse for the men who are so fond of making percentages and taking averages; and the sad total of mortality which is presented makes us readily understand why there was so much mystery about the French returns at a time when our special correspondents told us everything that was happening to our troops, and invited us to form conjectures about everything that was going to happen.

"Even in peace," says Dr. Chenu, "the French soldier is badly cared for, despite his exceptional and somewhat invidious privileges. It would be much better to give him a little more meat and to vary somewhat his very monotonous diet, even if he was charged a little more for his tobacco. Put a light tax on his locomotion, and employ the proceeds in ventilating his barracks, and giving him, at least, the number of cubic feet indispensable for health. The Romans, too, remember, never built a barrack without attaching to it one of those warm baths for which they were so famous; the French soldier often goes from year's end to year's end without even washing his feet. No wonder the death-rate is double as high as that of the general

population—ten instead of five per cent.; and yet the army is made up of the men who ought to be the healthiest in the community."

The following figures are something frightful. The French lost (they say) 95,615 in the Crimean war; of these 10,240 fell on the field, about the same number died of their wounds, while 75,000 *perished by disease*. In other words, of the average number of troops employed, 34 per 1,000 died of their wounds directly or subsequently, and 121 per 1,000 of sickness unconnected with actual warfare. Our rate at the same time was 23 deaths per 1,000 from wounds, 93 from sickness. Details make the difference more striking. In the winter of 1856-7, when there was no longer any serious fighting, the French had only 323 wounded, while 12,872 came into their hospitals for scurvy, of whom 964 died, and 19,303 *were treated for typhus, of whom 10,278 died*. We had, during the same period, in a force about a third the size of theirs, only 209 men ill of scurvy and 31 of typhus, of whom 17 died. If we suffered most during the beginning of the war, we certainly had learnt before it was over to take care of our men in a way which the French never attempted. A great deal of this terrible loss might have been avoided. As usual, the French "departments" were quarrelling among themselves, each head setting his personal dignity above the welfare of the troops. The doctors could not be blamed; they sacrificed themselves nobly. Out of a staff of 450, 82 died, 58 of them of typhus. But they never had a sufficient proportion: we had just as many with a third of their men. Our rule, and that of the Americans, is that no doctor in hospital should have more than 100 patients: the French doctors at Constantinople had to take care of more than 300 apiece. This was nearly as bad as the field work in Italy, when, at Solferino, every ambulance-doctor had to attend to 500 wounded men, so that, supposing him to work for twenty hours, he would have had an average of three minutes for each patient. No doubt the French may fairly (on paper) boast that no European power keeps so large an army going at so small a money cost as they do. But then money is not everything. France, least of all countries, can afford the drain of a very high death-rate in the army; and we begin to think of the traditional "Frenchman's horse," when we are told that by putting everything out of the control of the doctors, and placing it under a superintendent, the daily cost per patient in hospital was reduced to 2s. 2d. all through the Crimean war, while the corresponding cost to us was 4s.; whereas in the French hospitals the loss was twenty-six per

cent., in ours it was less than thirteen. Surely this is as clear a case as we can have of false economy; proving (as Marshal Belleisle said long ago) "all niggardliness in war is just a way of cutting the soldier's throat." It is an instance of what the French call "*centralisation à outrance*!" the "intendant" has an impossible task to perform: provisions, transports, military chest, ambulances, hospitals—all are in his hands. The consequence is, since no man can multiply himself more than a given number of times, that things get into woeful confusion; and then come sad disputes between the said "intendant" and the surgeons and hospital doctors. He has the control of everything; but they, who are answerable for the health of the army, cry out when, for instance (as was the case during the Crimean war), 1,800 and 2,000 sick are heaped into one hospital. The letters which Dr. Chenu publishes, from Michel Lévy and Baudens, the successive health-inspectors to the "intendant" and to the War Minister, show that red tape ties up French officials far more tightly than it ever did the staff of any English Circumlocution Office. "The men die, but the rules and regulations are maintained," says Baudens; and certainly they did die at a rate which fully accounts for the Emperor's anxiety to finish the war just as we were warming to our work.

Of course the whole matter of military hygiene is a novelty. The volunteers of 1792, who drove the Prussians before them and pushed on into the heart of Germany, died by hundreds of "Mayence fever." We know what Walcheren did for us; and those wonderful Erckmann-Châtريان novels give us some idea of what a retreat was like, and of the chances against a man getting on his legs again when once he had dropped on the line of march. The Russians, in 1856, were probably not much beyond the French and English of the beginning of the century in military doctoring. They lost 30,000 men in the field during the war, while 600,000 of them *died of want and sickness*. Good air, dry camping-ground, some attention to drainage, food nourishing and varied—these would have saved perhaps five-sixths of this enormous loss. The state of the French before Sebastopol got rapidly worse and worse; our troops, though they suffered terribly at first, soon had (thanks mainly to the public press) increased attention, and therefore improved in condition. From November, 1854, to April, 1855, we had nearly 48,000 sick and wounded, of whom nearly 11,000 died. This was 5·8 per cent. of the effective force, and 23 per cent. of the sick. In the French army, for the same period, there were about the same number of deaths,



giving a death-rate of only 2·3 per cent. of the effective force, and 12·6 per cent. out of the sick. But in November, 1856, the mortality among our troops fell from 23 to 4 per cent. on the sick. By May, 1856, it had fallen to 1·7, or even 1·1 per cent., while that of the French had risen to 2·7 on the effective force, and 19·9 on the sick. The cause of this was that while under an unflinching system of red tape the French soldier fell into a low state, and "lost heart," the greatest efforts had been made in England to make up for the original shortcomings of the commissariat and other departments. No sooner did the *Times* letters begin to be published than Lord Panmure sent out a Commission, consisting of Dr. Sutherland, Mr. Rawlinson, and Dr. Milroy, with the fullest possible powers. "Don't be content with giving orders (said the instructions), see that what you suggest is carried out." Along with the Commission was Florence Nightingale, who at once said that 96 per cent. of the deaths in hospital, from May to July, 1855, had been preventible, and who proved her statement by the changes which she soon effected in the whole system of nursing. When our men had Miss Nightingale's nurses, and the French had only the old routine men-nurses, told off without any selection from the ordinary rank and file, it is easy to understand how our mortality rapidly diminished, while theirs remained as bad as ever—nay, grew much worse as the men's powers of endurance grew more and more exhausted. The French doctors cried out, some of them angrily (as we have seen), others in the resigned tones of men who expected to see their whole army perish before "red tape" would give way an inch. Dr. Scriver (writing quite at the end of the war) contrasts, sadly enough, the position of the two allied armies with regard to health. Barracks, railways, abundant food, he finds on the English side; while on the French side there are privations of all kinds, and the men, wholly uncared for and exposed in defending a line of 14 leagues, work with musket in one hand and pickaxe in the other. "It is not the Crimean climate (says he) that is to blame; the officers don't fall ill, because they are properly housed and fed. Typhus, our scourge, ought to be met not by mere doctoring, but by hygiene, hygiene, hygiene! Not to profit by the lessons of this war would be a crime against humanity (*de lèse humanité*)." Yet we are told that nothing has been done; the French army is in the same state, as to doctoring, in which it was on the day when the battle of the Alma was fought. The fact is, "departments" are very hard to move. It takes a good deal to make a

"board" confess that it was in the wrong, and call in the House of Commons to set things right, and ask for money and stir up the opposition of other "boards," by amending their self-love and attacking their privileges. We do it, because our Ministry respects public opinion, and because we have a press which is never afraid to speak the truth. But in France Government does not like newspaper discussions; evils which need only to be seen in order to be cured are sedulously covered up from the eyes of the public; and reforms, however well planned, fail miserably, because those whose interest it is to oppose them have it all their own way. The French Administration never owns itself in the wrong,—that is its fundamental rule,—and every authority which sets up to be infallible is sure to grow powerless and incapable of improvement. This is one of the evils of Cæsarism; and it is well that we, who are often tempted to long for "the beneficent rule of an intelligent despot," should know something of what is to be set against the relief which such a despot would give to men weary of St. Pancras Boards and such like "forms of local government."

The Italian campaign of 1859 found the French army just in the same state as to hygiene in which they were at the close of the Crimean war. There were four months, from January to May, for preparation; the military part was admirably equipped; but the experience of the former campaign was so thrown away that, in the most fertile country in Europe, the soldiers often had no bread and were driven to use maize-flour, which they did not know how to cook. By June, the hospitals were full; "insufficient food and want of proper shelter" being the cause of five out of six of the attacks. Staff-Surgeon Voghera writes to Baron Larrey, after the battle of Montebello, to say that he and three more are in charge of all the sick; we are at our wits' end (*sur les dents*). He has no nurses; some bandsmen have been told off for the work, but as they know nothing of nursing, they are of very little use. He asks for eight doctors, thirty nurses, linen instead of the moss which he has had to use for cold-water dressings, coverlets, &c. Above all, he asks for food: "Many of our wounded, I blush to say it, have lived for four days on public charity." At Solferino, everything ought to have been ready, for Solferino was not a surprise. The French had been for days on the look-out for the enemy, whom they meant to force to a battle. Yet the "flying ambulances" were more than four days in bringing in the wounded. Fancy a wounded soldier waiting four days uncared

for amid the dead and dying on the battle-field. In Italy there were 132 surgeons to 160,000 men, 0·82 per 1,000; in the Crimea the percentage had been 0·72 per 1,000; in the Algiers campaign there were 180 doctors for 30,000 men, 6 per 1,000, nearly eight times as many, in proportion, as there were in Italy; so that France would seem to have been going back instead of improving in this matter. Under the First Empire there was very little talk about hygiene in medical science, and the soldiers died in heaps after battles like Leipsic; yet the ambulances had a staff four or five times as strong as they have now-a-days. One ambulance, with four surgeons, for each division, seems a ridiculously small complement. No wonder Baron Larrey, soon after the campaign of 1859 began, called out for 300 more surgeons. The Minister of War gave him 150, and that number had to be made up with Sardinian doctors and medical students, of whom a French doctor says: "Next to the rifled cannon, I think the most destructive engine of war is the Turin practitioner; he is a disciple of Sangrado, and treats diarrhoea, typhoid fever, ague, and everything as a case for leeches and frequent bleeding."

Besides being too few, the surgeons in the Italian war seem to have been sadly snubbed. They suffered much, as our own army-doctors do (or did), and with far less reason, since their social rank is much higher, compared with that of the officers, than in our army. The Administration leaves them to move about as best they can; instead of riding up to the scene of action, they jolt along perched on the ambulance-waggons like mutes on a hearse when the funeral is over. Every supply of lint, or bandages, or splints, has to be begged for at headquarters. As for dispersing the sick, the "red tape" believes that with twenty cubic yards of air for each bed there can be no mischief going on; nor can the belief be shaken, even if the doctors prove that the death-rate is enormous, and that the hospital has become a focus of infection. Think of trying to persuade "red tape" that (as the Americans have lately stated) every hospital becomes unfit for use after from five to ten years, and ought to be pulled down and rebuilt. Crowded hospitals mean blood-poisoning and frequent amputations; but "red tape" will not see this, and so a vast number of poor fellows are needlessly thrown upon the world, a burden to themselves and to their friends. The Italian war only lasted two months; yet the deaths in hospital were more numerous than those in the field. Dr. Chenu's book is the most emphatic condemnation which could be pronounced upon the French system of army surgery.

Let us now see how they manage these things in the United States. In 1861 the whole army of the Federation consisted of a few thousands of men employed on frontier service against the Indians. Their whole medical staff, organised on the old French model, was on the most meagre scale,—not sufficient for 20,000 men,—when it had suddenly to deal with “the biggest war the world has ever seen,” a war which cost the Federals alone, at least, 280,000 men. As soon as Fort Sumter was taken, the volunteers began to crowd in—clerks, artisans, students—officered, for the most part, by men as ignorant of military matters as they were themselves. Men who had been through the Mexican campaign shook their heads, and prophesied disasters like Bull Run; but disasters are soon repaired when a whole nation takes any work thoroughly in hand. All through the North a multitude of associations started up,—not a village in which the women were not scraping lint, making up parcels of clothes, books and newspapers, subscribing for, and sending in nurses, and so on. These isolated efforts were soon systematised; Dr. Elisha Harris and Mr. Henry Bellows, Unitarian Minister in New York (both the names deserve to be put on record), formed “The Women’s Central Association for the Help of the Sick and Wounded;” and this Association, before its work had come to an end, had received subscriptions to the amount of more than fifteen millions sterling. But lint and newspapers, and lady-nurses, would not do much without doctors. A thorough reform was needed in the “department.” Mr. Bellows took with him three doctors, Elisha Harris, aforesaid, Harsen and Van Buren, and attacked the Washington authorities in language which contrasts strikingly with the timidity of the French army-doctors even during the worst Crimean times. “We must have (said they) a Sanitary Commission, not *when the war is over*, as France and England had after the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny, but *now*. There is plenty of enthusiasm in the country; let Government give it moral support by officially recognising it.” A fortnight after, “the Commission of inquiry and advice about everything touching the health of the armies of the Union” began sitting at Washington. Mr. Bellows, the minister, a civil engineer, a professor, four doctors, and two officers were the whole staff,—asking no salary, but claiming the right of investigating everything, and of corresponding confidentially with the medical department. Lincoln laughed at them, but he let them have their way. “They’re just like a fifth wheel to a coach (said he); they do no good, but they don’t stop

the running." The people, however, took up the Commission, and the army soon got to depend on "the Sanitary" in all emergencies. Government by public opinion answered in this case; but then Mr. Bellows and his associates had the good sense never to go beyond their sphere. They kept true to their motto: "not to supplant the Government, but to fill up its shortcomings."

They had a hard task before them; most of the officers knew no more of sanitary matters than the soldiers whom they commanded. Such men, when talked to about the cleanliness of the soldiers, the ventilation of barracks, tents and huts, the choice and cooking of the food, and so forth, were very likely to rap out a few big oaths and to aver that they hadn't come out to keep a boarding-house or to turn dry nurse. What had the health of the men to do with them? They were there to fight, and the rest must take care of itself. Then the hospitals were served and organised anyhow, and the doctors, taken haphazard from town practice, knew nothing of their special work, and were, in many cases, wholly ignorant of surgery. The first thing the Commissioners did was to print and spread broadcast a number of little tracts on scurvy, dysentery, and military hygiene in general. Then they advised the establishment of well-arranged general hospitals, and moved that the army-doctors should be (as in England) wholly free from the control of the commissariat. This last proposal was strenuously opposed by the red-tapists; but the press fought for "the Sanitary," and by the middle of April, 1862, the medical department was reorganised by a law of Congress, and nearly all the suggestions of the Commission were adopted, the number of the medical staff being raised to 6,057 for the 800,000 men enrolled in the armies of the Union. This is almost exactly the number of men serving in the French Republican armies in 1794; their medical staff, however, numbered 8,000. On the contrary, the French army before the present war only possessed about 1,000 doctors and surgeons—a very poor supply indeed in case of a sudden strain.

With men like Frederic Law Olmsted and Dr. W. Hammond (who rose by dint of merit from surgeon-major to be surgeon-in-chief, with the rank of brigadier-general), there were naturally all sorts of valuable arrangements; such, for instance, as the "hospital steamers," which, thanks to the river-system of the States, was able to follow the armies everywhere. On board these boats every man, as he was brought in, was put into a well-warmed bed, and at once supplied with food and stimulants and medical help. What a contrast to the way in which the wounded usually fare on the

field of battle. The contrast between a Union hospital-ship, or one of the waggon-hospitals (of which they borrowed the idea from the Prussians), and the French hospital-transport in the Black Sea, is so striking, that we can scarcely believe we are reading of the same century. The account given by head navy doctor Marroin, and embodied in Dr. Chenu's book, of the voyage of the *Jean Bart*, in May, 1855, is so painful that we are fain to leave it untranslated. There were 720 soldiers on board, of whom 300 were frostbitten, 200 suffering from severe dysentery, 100 from typhus, and so on. The lower deck was assigned to the worst cases. The weather was so rough that the ports had to be closed, and very little could be done in the way of ventilation from above. The result was, "la matière des vomissements se mêlait aux déjections alvines sur les matelas, sur le pont. L'eau de mer embarquait par les écobiers, charriant d'une extrémité de la batterie à l'autre cette masse d'ordures d'une repoussante fétidité." We can well fancy the *Jean Bart* became a plague-ship long before it reached Scutari. Field hospitals, used long ago by the French in Algeria, but afterwards given up in spite of the protests of Michel Lévy, Baudens, and the other doctors, were wonderfully improved by the Americans. Instead of a great block of building, which is sure in time to get so unwholesome that the best thing that could happen would be for it to be burnt down, they built sets of wooden "pavilions," united by open galleries, along which rails were laid, so that patients could be wheeled to their bath in the most comfortable style. Of course there was abundance of hot and cold water laid on; and not only air but sun was secured by attention to the aspect of the rooms. In this way 3,000 could be kept in one hospital without any of the usual evils of over-crowding. Surely this is a point on which we may well learn something from American experience. "Never in the history of the world (says Dr. Hammond) was the mortality in hospital kept down to such a low rate; never were hospitals so wonderfully free from the usual hospital maladies." One thing which, no doubt, helped men to get well was the free-and-easy life in hospital. The sick soldier was no longer treated like a man in barracks, answering not to his name but to a certain number. He seemed to have returned to home-life; and a delightful little book, called *Hospital Days*, the journal of Miss Stuart Woolsey, lady-superintendent of the Fairfax Hospital, near Washington, shows with what motherly tact the men were cared for. "All the sick men loved flowers (writes Miss Woolsey): 'I've something for you,' said I to a New England lad, who was very ill,



'something that grows in front of your house at home; guess what it is,' and I held a bunch of lilac, the first of the year, behind my back. 'It's lilac,' whispered he, and I laid the flowers in his thin hands. 'Oh, yes, lilac: how did you know they grew there?'" She tells, too, of a poor Frenchman, who, having lost his right arm, learnt while in hospital to write beautifully with his left, hoping, when he got out, to be taken on by somebody as clerk; and of another who, when asked if he wanted anything, said, "Oh, no; there's everything here that one could wish for." "But isn't there anything you could fancy, now?" "Well, I sometimes seem to long for a drop of red wine; but I know that doesn't grow in Virginia." After that the poor fellow got his allowance of Burgundy every morning, and the song which he sang to welcome it kept the whole ward in good humour for hours. We may call this spoiling the soldier; but the men spoiled in this way did not fight the worse for it, and the moral effect of women's work—such as that of Mrs. Barlow, who on the day of her marriage set out with her husband to join the army, followed him through all his campaigns (he rose to be general), was cooking for the wounded while he was in the fight at Fredericksburg, and at last died, worn out by incessant work, before Petersburg—was no doubt immense: it braced up the volunteer part, which if not numerically, yet in every other respect was the mainstay of the force. As for food, never did soldiers—not even the Prussians who were quartered in Frankfort after Sadowa—fare so luxuriously as the sick and wounded Federals. But then before they were wounded they got very different rations from those in the French or English armies; and the wisdom of the American plan was shown in the almost entire freedom from scurvy and typhus. It is certainly cheaper to feed your men well than to have to fill up by fresh recruiting the ugly gaps which disease makes in your regiments. Men who had undergone amputation seem to have been stuffed in a truly aldermanic way. Miss Woolsey tells us of one Vermont volunteer who lost his arm, and who, beginning on beef-tea and "egg-nog" (eggs and punch), at the rate of two dozen eggs in two dozen ounces of brandy in the first twenty-four hours after the operation, along with the "tea" from thirteen pounds of lean beef, went on within three days to beefsteaks, porter, poached eggs, chickens, oysters, &c. His eating powers astonished even the Yankee lookers-on. He got well: indeed he wrote home to say he never felt stronger in his life. The beef-tea and egg-nog diet was due to the doctor's notion that after an operation Nature wants special help to enable her to get through an unaccustomed

task. In spite of all that has been done to improve the diet of our men, in barrack and in hospital, it will be a very long time before any of them has the opportunity of showing whether a Britisher can, under the same circumstances, rival the achievements of the Vermont man. Nor, though help of all kinds came in in the utmost profusion,—“avalanches of vegetables from the Western farmers,”—did the army trust wholly to friends outside. At the Murfreesborough Hospital, thirty-five acres of land were cleared, and on these the men grew, besides flowers, salads, melons, &c., 1,200 bushels of potatoes, 25,000 head of cabbage, and other vegetables in like proportions. When he was out of hospital the soldier was received in a “home” until he could get his arrears and his discharge. Of these homes there were forty between Washington and Brownsville in Texas, and they are said to have supplied four and a half millions of rations. The Americans calculate that by precautions such as these which we have named, they saved the lives of 100,000 men. But they did much more; they taught the soldier that the nation really cared for him, that he was something more than a mere mercenary in the eyes of his countrymen. Sisters of charity will never supply the place of women like Mrs. Barlow and Miss Woolsey. Miss Nightingale set the example of treating soldiers like human beings, and not like ticketed bales of flesh and bones, and her example was nobly followed in America. The Federal system told wonderfully when the armies came to be disbanded. The world has never seen such a sight as that army of the Potomac, 200,000 strong, passing in review before the new President, piling their arms, and going back each man to his old occupation, without titles, pensions, or decorations. The French reformers are beginning to look to America, and to ask why all their medical department is on such a different plan; why, for instance, help from the people is discouraged in every possible way instead of being welcomed. They think that they, the military nation *par excellence*, have a great deal to learn from the nation which is only a beginner in the art of war. Surely we, too, in whose army the death-rate is so needlessly high, whose Indian hospitals and barracks are so often mere pest-houses, may take some hints from the way in which the Federals managed their military hygiene. We are promised many and radical changes in our army: confessedly there are many things to be changed in what concerns the health and comfort of the soldier in time of peace, and also in the arrangements for tending and doctoring him during a campaign.

- ART. IV.—1. *The Mythology of the Aryan Nations*. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. Two Vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.
2. *Völsunga Saga*. The Story of the Volsungs and Niblungs, with certain Songs from the Elder Edda. Translated from the Icelandic. By EIRIKR MAGNUSSON and WILLIAM MORRIS. London: F. S. Ellis. 1870.
3. *The Queen of the Air*. A Study of the Greek Myths of Cloud and Storm. By JOHN RUSKIN, LL.D. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1869.
4. *Juventus Mundi*. Gods and Men of the Heroic Age. By WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE. London: Macmillan and Co. 1869.

THE new light derived from the discovery of Sanskrit and the growth of the Science of Language has nowhere fallen with more startling effect than on the study of primitive myths. The attention of former days was concentrated almost entirely on the legends of Greece. Their surpassing beauty, their poetic interest, their prestige as the storehouse of two of the greatest literatures of the world, fixed the universal gaze, the more so as there was nothing to distract it. The study of the Indian literature, however, changed the whole aspect of things. It was seen that the Greeks stand in close genealogical proximity to many other nations and races both of Europe and Asia. Amongst these, often widely sundered by space and time, a mythology was found to obtain, less artistically developed than the Hellenic, but still substantially the same. Above all, in tracing back the stream of Aryan history, there appeared a time when this common folk-lore did not exist—a time of which distinct traces are preserved in written records older than Homer himself. Thus the previous difficulty of explaining the legends of Greece has been materially lightened. Parallels have presented themselves for this heretofore unique mythology; and, instead of the complex phenomena, we may examine the simple elements out of which they grew. Working with the methods of comparison and history, which have proved such useful instruments in other fields, it becomes possible to refer the genesis of mythology to causes at once simpler and more adequate than those assumed by hypotheses before current.

The science thus brought into existence has been vigorously prosecuted both in this country and on the Continent. The work of Mr. Cox, however, is the first that has appeared in

English professing to deal with the whole subject, and combining the results already obtained with the valuable products of original research. Professor Max Müller has hitherto confined himself in this department to essays and incidental notices, or, at most, to oral lectures. But much has been done in the way of collecting materials. The labours of such writers as Dr. Dasent, Mr. Campbell, Miss Frere, Mr. Baring-Gould, and Mr. Ludlow, together with the great work of Grimm, has put the popular traditions of our race well before us. Mr. Morris's poems have excited an interest, both in Norse and Greek stories, which his prose translations from the Icelandic cannot but increase. Mr. Cox's volumes have a more scientific character; yet they are by no means dry, and it is to be hoped that they will tend to foster the interest already felt in the study of mythology.

We need not discuss at length the hypotheses of which we have just spoken touching the origin of the myths. The ancient schools of euemeristic and symbolic interpretation, in spite of the great names associated with them, may be passed by as resting on no foundation whatsoever. The same must be said of Mr. Grote's ingenious treatment of the mythical times. "The past that never was present," the background created by an imaginative people to fill a blank, expresses admirably the relation of mythology to authentic history, but is inadequate as accounting for the origin of the legends.

The principle upon which Mr. Gladstone labours to account for the Homeric myths—namely, that they are blurred and distorted reminiscences of primeval revelation—while it commends itself by the homage which it pays to the authority of Holy Scripture, and within certain limits by considerations of *a priori* probability and of analogical fact, must be pronounced a wholly insufficient explanation when applied to that vast and various Aryan mythology of which the Homeric legends are but a fraction, which stands apart by itself as a family cluster, so far as is yet ascertained, distinct from all other mythologies whether of the ancient or modern world, and which embraces a multitude of phenomena of such a kind as that, though connected by origin and descent, they have nothing in common with religious truth and the momentous topics of the Bible.\*

The similarity of the legends among peoples that must

---

\* The above-mentioned theories serve to explain certain features in the after-growth of mythology. It is chiefly with respect to its rise that they are unsatisfactory.

have been for centuries before the opening of authentic history wholly, or in great part, ignorant of each other's existence, would seem to fix the origin of this common inheritance in times before their separation. This we might conclude from the facts themselves. But philology has demonstrated that these very peoples are, indeed, branches of the same stock, children in various lines and stages of descent belonging to common ancestors. The evidence by which this consanguinity is established incidentally furnishes a tolerably vivid picture of the stage of advancement reached by our distant forefathers before their dispersion. The nation, whom for convenience we call Aryan, though there is little to show that they called themselves by this title, appear to have inhabited the western side of the plateau of Central Asia. They were a pastoral people, somewhat advanced in the mechanical arts, possessed of permanent habitations, and though unacquainted with the sea familiar with navigation. The names of the common objects of such a life are the same in most of the branch-tongues, and if in some they have been displaced, there is no doubt but that words common, for instance, to Latin and Sanskrit, though not found in the Greek, are the lineal descendants of the old Aryan terms. The most remarkable evidence of civilisation is found in the identity of the numerical system, and of the names of the simpler numbers in all the allied languages. The decimal notation must have been in use when "the Kelt knew the Indian" as the companion of his daily life.

Not only can we thus recall the society of the epoch of separation, but we may even form some vague estimate of the length of time during which they had been together as one people, united amongst themselves, but distinct from the Semitic and Turanian tribes. Remote as must be the date of the dispersal, we find in the language then spoken traces of decay, the effects of long time. The names of family relationship, and some few other words, have become merely technical symbols. The Aryan no more thought of the derivation of "father" and "mother" than we do. Yet the origin of the terms is transparent. There are many ways in which the idea of "father" may be expressed in Sanskrit, the oldest of the second generation of tongues. We need only instance the familiar forms, *pitar* (πατήρ, father) and *janitar* (γενετήρ, genitor), whereof the latter is derived from the root *gan*, to beget, the former from *pa*, to protect. But the word "pitar" has become conventional, while "janitar" is less usual, and employed only in its etymological sense. The original meaning of

*bhratar* (brother) was "he who carries or assists," of *svasar* (sister), "she who pleases." Still stranger is the derivation of "daughter." *Duhitar* (*δυήτις*) is derived from *duh*, a root which, in Sanskrit, means to milk. Müller, following Lassen, connects it with *duco*, comparing for the sense *traire* and *trahere*. The daughter of a pastoral household is mainly useful as a milk-maid, so that this title becomes, as it were, her generic name. Thus we see how what we should at first regard as the simplest of words are really gradual developments from physical ideas, thus proving, as Mr. Cox points out, the sagacity of Locke's prediction, that "if we could trace them to their sources, we should find in all languages the names which stand for things that fall not under our senses to have had their first rise from sensible ideas."\*

Conceive a people in such a mental condition as these facts indicate—unable, and yet not feeling their inability, to express the simplest general and abstract conceptions, except in language that bore a physical meaning. Let anyone try to deal with a philosophical or scientific subject in words of pure Saxon origin, and he will find himself unable to convey many ideas without free use of metaphor and words, with the air of a material sense. Yet Anglo-Saxon is infinitely richer than was the old Aryan.

"His mental condition," says Mr. Cox of a member of this society, "determined the character of his language, and that condition exhibits in him, as in children now, the working of a feeling which endows all outward things with a life not unlike his own. Of the several objects which met his eye, he had no positive knowledge, whether of their origin, their nature, or their properties; but he had life, and, therefore, all things else must have life also. He was under no necessity for personifying them, for he had, for himself, no distinction between consciousness and personality. He knew nothing of the conditions of his own life, or of any other object; and, therefore, all things on the earth, or in the heavens, were invested with the same vague idea of existence. The sun, the moon, the stars, the ground on which he trod, the clouds, storms, lightnings, were all living beings—could he help thinking that, like himself, they were conscious beings also? His very words would, by an inevitable necessity, express this conviction. His language would admit no single expression from which the attribute of life was excluded,

\* A very striking instance of early loss of etymological meaning by conventional abstraction is given by Müller (Chips. ii. 28): *goyuga* meant, originally, a yoke of oxen (*go*, cow; *yuga*, yoke). It came in time to be the expression for any pair whatsoever, till a pair of oxen is actually expressed by *gogoyuga*, cf. *ἰπποβοῦκόλος*, and our own phrase, a false verdict. *Gopayati* means "to protect,"—thus: *gopa*, herdman; thence *ποιμὴν λαόν*, a king; thence the verb "to act like a king."



while it would vary the forms of that life with unerring instinct. Every object would be a living reality, and every word a speaking picture. . . . For every aspect of the material world he would have ready some life-giving expression; and these aspects would be scarcely less varied than his words. The same object would, at different times, and under different conditions, awake the most opposite or inconsistent conceptions. But these conceptions and the words that expressed them would exist side by side without producing the slightest consciousness of their incongruity. . . . But it would be no personification, and still less would it be an allegory or metaphor. It would be to him a veritable reality, which he examined and analysed as little as he reflected on himself."—*Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, vol. i. pp. 40-42.

After all the discoveries of science, and well knowing the inaccuracy of our language, we still speak of the sun rising and setting, of his gaining the highest point of the arch of heaven, of his emerging from behind the clouds and sinking beneath the waves; so strong is the association of old ideas and words. And yet, it is not really this that makes us cling to the old phrases, but because they represent the facts more vividly than literal expressions. But to the child-like man of old to say that the sun rose, was to say the same thing as that he himself rose. He strictly conceived the sun as coming out of his chamber, or the morning as leaving her bed. Where we say "the day breaks," he saw an external power clearing a passage for the dawn. He watched the sun rise. He saw the dark horizon open. It was the throwing back of doors that the sun might come forth of his chamber. He saw the long lines of light hurrying hither and thither. The dawn was seeking for something; the clouds concealed it. He spoke of the dawn, fair, fresh, and young, as a maiden; close behind her comes the hot sun. He was pursuing her, and she fled. Larger and larger grew his form. He was gaining on her. But when he stands out all risen the dawn is gone, and the pursuer is left alone. At another time the coming of the sun, where there was no sign of him before, would be called by the only name that represented such a causeless presence—his birth from the womb of the morning. Sometimes he seemed to rise with difficulty. The clouds struggled hard to keep him down. He fought with the dark powers, and at length overcame them. He broke through all with irresistible might. He shot forth his bright far-darting lances and discomfited them. But as the day went on the clouds gathered thicker and stronger than before. The irresistible sun struggles in

vain against them. He is overborne and sinks in blood and fire, leaving the spectators to mourn his short and glorious life. At times he seemed to be burnt to death in the blaze of light; the clouds across his face made him appear torn in pieces. What more natural than to say that a garment of fire is about him which he strives in vain to tear off? The nightfall presented another picture. The twilight, the dew, that was lost in the morning is there again. The loved one who vanished is come back to cheer his dying moments. He has been seeking the lost all day, and finds her only to die. The thoughts of this kind that the daily life of the sun alone would suggest, are almost numberless. The very food and breath of this early people was poetry, yet they had no intention of using any but the plainest and most ordinary language. It was plain enough to them. There was no metaphor. To talk of literal and figurative language in the early world would be as great an anachronism as to speak of Federals and Confederates in the War of Independence. They did not yet exist.

Nor would it be correct to say that the powers of nature were conceived as persons. The conception of personality is compounded of a series of sensations, plus the notion that they all proceed from one source. The Aryan mind, at the time we speak of, had only reached the first stage. We talk of the new moon without thinking of inquiring what has become of the old ones. Our forefathers spoke, not merely of a new moon, but of a new sun, and meant what they said. The earliest Vedic hymns are far more modern than the epoch under consideration, yet even there we find that but a faint hold had yet been taken upon the invariability of nature. The "Titanic assurance" with which we say "the sun *must* rise," was unknown to them. They ask, in all good faith, Will the sun return? Will he ever rise again? Has the night slain him utterly? This hints not obscurely at a time when the question was, Shall we have a sun again? Will the night give birth to another child? It took a long time for the notion of the sun's identity to be formed. Before the time to which the Vedas take us back, this step has been taken. But no more. There is a vague idea of personality, but all is floating and unfixed. At times, the same word represents one thing; at others, not indeed another, but something inconsistent with identity. Thus, the same god (if we may use so definite a term) is now husband and now father, now sister and now wife, now brother and now child. Even in our own day such ways of speaking occur. We may

talk of the evening candle as though it were always the same; at another time the distinct personality of the different candles will be uppermost in our thoughts, and will be expressed in our words. This is a relic of the time when there were many things in this half-personal condition. These illustrations are childish; but we are trying to recall a state of childishness.

The existence of this, if we may so call it, *prepersonal period* is proved by unavoidable induction from the facts of the Vedas. A glance at them will, therefore, be necessary that we may see the incoherent elements of mythology in a state of incipient coalescence, the forerunner of the crystallised forms of Greek and Scandinavian legend.

The highest power conceived by the Aryans was Dyaus, or Dyū, the clear bright sky. Before the first sound of Sanskrit had been heard in the land of the five streams, the Aryan race had felt the need of a name for the highest power—for the source of life, the Creator of the whole universe. They had already asked themselves the question, and given the answer that we find in the Vedic poet: "Who can tell whence this creation arose? The gods are subsequent to its production! Who, then, knows whence it sprang? He who in the highest heaven is its ruler, he knows—or, *perhaps, not even he!*" And they called him by the best and highest name in their vocabulary—the heaven, Dyū (in the nominative, Dyaus), the *Zeus* of the Greek, the Jous (jovis) of the Italian, the Tiu of the Teuton, still preserved in the half of the English Tuesday. If this were the only fruit of our science it would be worth all the trouble. "These words," says Max Müller, "are not mere words; they are historical facts—ay, facts more immediate, more trustworthy than many facts of mediæval history." The first name by which the common fathers of Europe, of Persia, and of India, worshipped God was the one we use every day, "Dyaus Pitar, Our Father which art in heaven."

This Dyaus is the father of all things (janitor). The mother of his children is Prithivī, the broad earth. They thus answer to the *Oûpavós* and *Taîa* of Hesiod. But here a strange interchange of attributes has taken place. *Oûpavós*, as we have seen, is not the same name as Dyaus. He appears in the Veda as Varuna, the heaven under another aspect. Dyū is the shining one; Varuna, the outspread, the ever present. But in the pre-Vedic time the distinction was not clearly marked. Knowing that Dyaus and Varuna were the same, they did not care whether Prithivī, the earth, were said

to be the wife of the one or the other. But as Greek and Hindoo parted, each taking with them these ideas and names, the titles and the attributes became transposed. The Greeks clung to the chief God by the name of *Zeús*, and *Oûpanós* became nothing but the husband of *Taía*, the physical progenitor of all things. On the other hand, the Punjaubees upheld the majesty of Varuna, who became to them the highest and most spiritual being of their pantheon. And very exalted was this idea. Mr. Cox sees in it the primitive Aryan monotheism. There is nothing in Homer or Hesiod so spiritual as the following prayer, which, if there were no conflicting circumstances, would seem to establish the worship of one God in the North-West of India at a period of unknown antiquity:—

“Let me not yet, O Varuna, enter into the house of clay—have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. If I go along trembling like a cloud driven by the wind, have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright God, have I gone to the wrong shore; have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Thirst came upon the worshipper though he stood in the midst of the waters; have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Whenever we men, O Varuna, commit an offence before the Heavenly Host,—whenever we break thy law through thoughtlessness,—have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.”  
—*Mythology of Aryan Nations*, vol. i. pp. 331, 332.

As Varuna grew Dyaus sank. Preserved by the Greek, he was forgotten by the Hindoo for a nearer and more material power, who, in time, overthrew Varuna himself. Indra, the giver of rain, the son of Dyaus and Prithivi, grew up, like the Zeus of Æschylus, to dethrone his father. Greece had no need of Indra, so Zeus kept his place. But the gratitude of the Hindoo for rain made him give his deepest worship, his choicest offerings, to the rain god, and Dyaus and Varuna die away. Dyaus is the god of the Aryan race; Varuna, of the earliest life of India; Indra, of the later Vedas; and thence sprang all the countless monstrosities of modern Hindustan.

Indra, then, the third great deity of the Veda, is the sky, regarded as the rain-giver; the same idea that the Latins, having lost the old Aryan name, had to express by Jupiter Pluvius. His name is derived from the same root as the Sanskrit *indu*, a drop. The conception of Indra is everywhere a grosser one than that of Dyaus or Varuna. He is a physical power, and at times identified with the sun, which, again, at times,—and this is perhaps the earliest notion,—is only his chariot. The connection of Indra and the sun arises thus: the clouds are always regarded, not as the givers, but

as the withholders of rain. They have to be fought with and made to yield their treasures. And this is the work of Indra. He never rises to the dignity of a spiritual god. The growth of Indra into the chief deity of India is, perhaps, the earliest traceable step in the degradation of the Father in heaven that the whole Aryan race had once worshipped.

These three, with Agni (ignis, the fire) are the great figures of the earlier Vedic hymns. They are not mythological beings, for mythology as yet is not. But we are a step nearer to it. Personality has grown up. The names under which the powers of heaven are described have become proper names. Yet it is but a momentary personality. It is plain whence the names arose, and no confusion results from their use.

"The Vedic gods are peculiarly transparent. Instead of one acknowledged king, each is lord in his own domain, each is addressed as the maker of all visible things, while their features and characters are in almost all cases interchangeable. Dyaus and Indra, Varuna and Agni, are each in his turn spoken of as knowing no superior. And the objects of their chief care are not the children of men, but the winds, the storms, the clouds and the thunder, which are constantly rising in rebellion against them. No sooner is one conflict ended than another is begun, or rather the same conflict is repeated as the days and seasons come round."—*Mythology of Aryan Nations*, vol. i. p. 337.

This first stage of development may conveniently be designated *the period of momentary personality*. The Vedic gods are persons only for the time being.

From the Veda we turn to our next oldest literary witness—the Homeric and Hesiodic poems. Between the period depicted in them, and the separation from the common stock, the history of the Hellenic people is shrouded in almost impenetrable darkness. When we again catch sight of them, we find that a great advance has taken place in the growth of mythology. The old Aryan life is part of the long-forgotten past, and with it has disappeared the freshness and elasticity of the early days. The fluid material of the myths has become fixed. *Personality has developed into individuality*. Dyaus and Varuna, we saw, might interchange attributes and relationships. Not so Zeus and Ouranos. They are, without variation, respectively son and father. There cannot now be more than one almighty or supreme at once. The supremacy of Ouranos must, therefore, precede that of his son.\*

\* Indeed Ouranos, whose name always retains its first physical sense, and is never lost behind the personal god, has little place in Greek logography, but

An organised theogony begins to arise. This individualising of the impersonalities of primæval Aryan belief entailed a process to which, rather than to wilful and unprovoked depravity, is to be assigned the repulsiveness of many of the Greek legends. However it arose, Plato was equally justified in denouncing the immoral tendency of the religious belief of his time. He only erred in tracing its origin to individual poets:—

“It is simply impossible to believe that the great Athenian poets were descended from a people who, some centuries earlier, had deliberately sat down to invent loathsome or ridiculous fictions about the gods whom they worshipped, and the heroes whom they revered. To the mind of *Æschylos* there was a depth of almost inexpiable guilt in the sacrifice of *Iphigeneia*. The imagination of *Sophokles* was oppressed by the unconscious incest of *Oidipous*, and all its frightful consequences, while *Pindar* turned aside with contemptuous indignation from the stories which told of gods devouring their own offspring. But we to whom the tale of *Kronos* points to the time which consumes the years to which it has given birth; we for whom the early dawn of the virgin *Iphigeneia*, caused by the wrath of *Artemis*, is a mere reflection of the lot which pressed alike on *Dahanâ* and *Daphne*, on *Iolê* and *Brynhild* and *Oionê*; we who can read in the woeful tale of *Iokastê*, the return of the lord of day, the slayer of the sphinx, and of the python, to the mother who had borne him in the morning, must feel, that if Greeks or Northmen, who told of such things, are to be condemned, they must be condemned on other grounds, and not because in *Achilleus*, or *Sigurd*, or *Odysseus*, they have given us pictures of obstinate inaction or brutal revenge. Possibly, to some among those old poets, the real nature of the tales which they were telling was not so completely hidden as we may deem. It is not easy to think that the writer of the hymn to *Hermes* knew nothing of the key which was to unlock all its secrets. The very form of their language would warrant us in saying much more. But the words of *Kumârila* prove, that among the Eastern Aryans the real character of their mythology had not been forgotten. He, too, had had to listen to complaints like those which *Pindar* and *Plato* bring against the follies or the vices of the gods. This answer is ready:—

“‘It is fabled that *Prajâpati*, the lord of creation, did violence to his daughter. But what does it mean? *Prajâpati*, the lord of creation, is a name of the sun, and he is called so because he protected all creatures. His daughter *Ushas* is the dawn. And when it is said that he was in love with her, this only means that, at sunrise,

that of father to Zeus. Ouranos and Gaia are still heaven and earth. “The gods are subsequent to their production.” However much, in *Hesiod*, Ouranos may wear the human form to *Euripides* (*Ion*, l. 1) he is still *θεῶν παλαιός οἶκος*, and no god at all.



the sun runs after the dawn ; the dawn being at the same time called the daughter of the sun, because she rises when he approaches. In the same manner, if it is said that Indra was the seducer of Ahalya, this does not imply that the god Indra committed such a crime ; but Indra means the sun, and Ahalya the night ; and as the night is seduced and ruined by the sun of the morning, therefore is Indra called the paramour of Ahalya.\*

"It is the legend of Oidipous and Iokasté, one of the most awful and, in some aspects, the most repulsive in the wide range of Greek mythology."—*Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, vol. i. pp. 87, 88.

The Greek mythology contrasts with the earlier Vedic no less in extent than in development. Both effects are due to one cause. We have seen how Zeus and Ouranos are but appellatives of the heaven crystallised into proper names. The other objects of nature, especially the sun and his attendants, had their own titles, and each had many. In the Veda this polyonymy is widely prevalent. Each deity is addressed by many names, that then were but epithets.\* These titles, from their religious sanction, would be preserved by the branches of the race long after their meaning had been forgotten, and the very form of the words changed by those phonetic laws that determine the differences of the various tongues. But compared with the changes of every-day speech, these forms were stationary. They soon then became individual names, and it was quite forgotten that they had ever been names of the same thing. This is the spring of most of the multitudinous variety of Greek tradition, which is but a modification of a few types.

The great seat of polyonymy, and, therefore, the great storehouse of secondary myths, is the solar course both daily and yearly. A few examples will serve both for proof and for explanation. One of the simplest cases is the legend of Eos. Her own name is yet transparent. She is the Ushas of the Veda—the growing one—the dawn. Her connection with Tithonos needs no interpretation. The part she plays in the story of Kephalos and Prokris is more human, but still everywhere betrays the dawn-myth. The birthplace of Prokris is Athens, the city of the dawn, and her mother is Eterse, the dew, while her own name denotes simply the sparkling drops.†

\* The so-called Orphic hymns of the Greeks are little else than inventions of particular gods by all the names that could rightly be applied to them. Many of these might easily be expanded into myths.

† Prokris is derived by Max Muller from *S. Prish*, to sprinkle. Cf. *πρόξ*, dew.

"The myth explains itself. Kephalos (*the head of the sun*) loves Prokris; in other words, the sun loves the dew. But Eos also loves Kephalos, i.e., the dawn loves the sun. Thus at once we have the groundwork for her envy of Prokris. So again when we are told that though Prokris breaks her faith, yet her love is still given to the same Kephalos, different though he may appear, we have only a myth formed from phrases that told how the dew seems to reflect, to be kissed by, many suns which are yet the same sun. The gifts of Artemis are the rays that flash from every dew-drop, which Prokris is described as being obliged to yield up to Kephalos, who slays her as unwittingly as Phoibos causes the death of Daphne, or Alpheos of Arethousa. The spot where she dies is a thicket in which the last dew-drops would linger till the approach of the noonday heats."—*Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, vol. i. p. 430.

Another name of the dawn is Ahanâ. It occurs but once in the Rig-Veda, but its character is so plain that we may be sure any phrases spoken of Ushas, or the other dawn-goddesses, might be applied to her. The words are, "Ahanâ comes near to every house—she who makes every day to be known." A variant form, Ahânâ would regularly appear in Greek as Athene. The great goddess of Athens, the patron of letters, is, therefore, a dawn-goddess. In Hesiod, she springs from the forehead of Zeus. Ushas, in the Veda, springs from the head of Dyu; the Murddhadivah, the East, the forehead of the sky. In Hesiod and Pindar it is Hephaistos that cleaves the passage, in Apollodorus and others, Prometheus or Hermes, all of whom are spoken of as the givers of fire to man. Again, Hesiod speaks of her as Tritogeneia, the child of Tritos. So utterly had the name of this deity fallen out of remembrance, that the epithet was explained by reference to the Libyan lake Tritonis, on the Bœotian stream Triton, and even a hypothetical Eolic word *τρίτος*, a head, was invented by the later logographers. This puzzle of the Greeks is answered by the Veda. There the waters and the air are under the sway of Trita, Triton, or Tritos; then the father of Athene is the same as Triton, Amphitritê, and the Tritopatores, or lords of the winds. Nor does the Veda fail to indicate the point of transition from the physical Ahanâ to the intellectual Athene.\* It is said of Ushas, "*Waking every mortal to walk about, she*

---

\* The intellectual side of Athene is almost all that appears in the Latin Minerva, a name which Max Müller connects with *mens*, *μῆνς*, S. *manas*, mind; and compares with Mane Mania, the mother of the Lares, and the verb Manare, as applied specially to the sun. Promeneuvare is used in the Carmen Saliare as = moneo. So purely intellectual a conception has, as might be expected, little or no Latin mythology.

receives praise from every thinker." The connection is close between light and knowledge ( $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  and  $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\iota\varsigma$ ).

There exist certain legends of Athene, which, from their inconsistency with her character as the virgin goddess, have been suffered to fall into forgetfulness. She is represented as the child, not of Zeus, but of the giant Pallas, who attempts her honour, and is slain by her. She is spoken of as the mother of Phoibos, and again of Lychnos, another Phaethon. Her part in the theft of Prometheus is due to her love for him. These fall into their proper place as soon as the dawn-origin of Athene is recognised.

Ahanā is but another form of Dahanā, which is the Sanskrit shape of Daphne. As Phoibos assaults Daphne, so Indra, Dahanā (the dawn). As Daphne vanishes, so does the dawn, afraid lest Indra (the bull) should slay her. The change of Daphne into a laurel is one of the frequent myths arising from a false etymology.\* Eos, Prokris, Athene, and Daphne do not by any means exhaust the list of Greek dawn-myths, but we cannot give more than a few examples. The direct solar myth extends its influence yet more widely. Let us take but the life of Herakles, and we shall find scarcely an incident that, on the one hand, is not paralleled in Greek, and often in foreign stories, and, on the other hand, does not coincide with some obvious, and in most cases extant, phrase about the sun.

Like Phoibos, Hermes, Perseus, and others, Herakles is the son of Zeus, the sky. Similarly Theseus, Bellerophon, &c., are children of Poseidon, or of some father whose name signifies the sea; for sky and sea may with equal propriety be regarded as the parent of the sun. At the very birth of Herakles is introduced the incessantly recurring struggle with the monstrous powers of darkness. It takes the Vedic form of a victory over the snake Ahi—the rise of the sun, in spite of the efforts of the dark to keep him down. This incident is again and again repeated in the labours of Herakles. As the other solar heroes fight with Python, and Sphinx, and Chimaira, or with bulls of supernatural strength, so he engages the lions of Kithairon and Nemea. Like Indra, he overcomes Sarvara, the dog Kerberos. He slaughters the Kentauri, the racing hurrying clouds—the Asvins multiplied; and if this achievement is reckoned rather as a crime, a parallel is

\* It has been suggested to us that this incident of the myth is due to the fact that the cool and shadowy dawn would seem to linger last about the thick-leaved laurel. The meaning of the laurel of Daphne would then be the same as the bush of Prokris.

found in the offence of Ixion. The many-headed Hydra is the vapour that rises again when it has been dispersed, and the immortal head signifies the impossibility of utterly and for ever dispelling the clouds. The skin of the Nemean lion, which Herakles wears, is the train of tawny vapour that hangs about the sun when he scatters his foes.\* According to Diodorus, the infant Herakles, like Paris, Oidipous, and Perseus (shall we say like Cyrus, and Romulus and Remus?), was exposed at his birth, and picked up by the dawn-goddess Athene, who besought Hêrê, the queen of the blue heaven, (whose name is closely allied to that of Herakles) to nourish it, but in vain; for Hêrê is already engaged, as the myth grew, in that jealousy of Zeus which is seen in Eos against Prokris, in Medeia against Glaukê, and later in our own legend in Deianeira against Iole, the natural result of the many marriages of the sky and of the sun. This exposure on plain, or sea, or hillside, more definitively on Ida (Ida is the earth in the Veda), is only the expression of the sun's resting, when his mother has left him, alone upon the horizon. The child grows up, as all the solar heroes do, the model of strength and power. His teachers point to the cloudland to which himself belongs. Autolykos and Eurytos, by whom he is taught to wrestle and to shoot with the bow, denote the light and splendour of the morning. Kastor, who trains him to fight in heavy armour, is the twin-brother of Polydeukes, these twins answering to the Asvins, the originals of the Kentaurs, so that Herakles' training corresponds to that of Jason and Achilleus. Linos, who teaches him music, is akin to Hermes, Pan, Orpheus, and Amphibia Raos. The weapons he used are the poisoned arrows of Philoktetes and Odysseus, but of no historic Greek. We need not trace all the "labours." Suffice it that the idea of the compulsory toil and danger is repeated in the servitude of Phoibos to Admetos, and together with Poseidon to Laomedon, and in the challenges given to Perseus and Jason. The regularity of the mighty sun's return could only be explained by the early race as the fulfilment of a task imposed by a higher power. His foes may be not all powers of night, but of winter also, like the dragon Fafnir of the north. That heroic chastity, which makes the Herakles of Proklus, the Galahad of Greek story, is consistent with the sun in some aspects, but utterly at variance with the myth of the fifty daughters of Thestios, which one version

---

\* It is the jackal's skin of the enchanted Hindoo Rajah, the fish skin of Proteus and Phoibos Delphinios.

connects with the destruction of the Nemean lion; here he is the sun with his many loves, the same conception that makes Zeus the amorous deity we know him for. The raging Herakles is the sun in his fierce heat burning up the fruits he fostered, so he slays his children by Megara and two of the sons of Iphikles.\* In the fight with Ares and Kyknos, we see the repetition of Indra fighting the battle of the heavenly gods against the rebels. The same thing makes Herakles the hero of the first Trojan war. He goes on the long western journey, like Perseus, crossing the sea in the golden cup of Helios. He plays again the part of Indra in recovering the lost cattle of the sun, the eldest form of which legend is probably preserved in the Virgilian story of Cacus. In the fiery death of Herakles looms the same magnificent sunset that is seen in the death of Jason. In short, there is scarcely a tale of Greek mythology that at one or more points is not touched by the life of Herakles. It will not, then, be necessary to notice more solar myths.

Yet there is one story that from its very complexity merits short notice. Sun-myth, dawn-myth, wind-myth are all combined in the legend of Orpheus. "Orpheus," says Professor Max Müller, "is the same word as the Sanskrit 'Ribhu' or 'Arbhu,' which, though it is best known as the name of the three Ribhus, was used in the Veda as an epithet of Indra and a name of the sun." The solar character of Orpheus is preserved in his connection with Eurydike, the wide-ruling dawn. In her story recurs the familiar plot of the vanished dawn, that her lover seeks and finds only to lose again. We have in her the fatal bite or sting of the snake, or thorn of winter or night, the claw of the demon that sends Suryabai to her death-like slumber, the spindle that wounds Briar Rose, the thorn that produces the trance of so many sleeping beauties in Scandinavian and Teutonic tales. Her story, too, gives the Greek form of the universal Aryan type,—the fatal look of lover on loved, the vanishing of the dew or the morning twilight when the sun has looked upon her, or it may be when she has looked upon him. The tale of Urvasi and Pururavas, the Hindoo form, runs that Urvasi (a name applied to the morning light) is wedded to Pururavas, on the condition that she should never see him unclothed. But the Gandhavas, resolved to break the union, steal one of the two lambs that are tied to her couch. Urvasi said, "They take

\* The relation of Iphikles to Herakles is that which Mr. Grote perceives in Patrokles to Achilles, and Telemachos to Odysseus, a weaker representation of the hero.

away my darling as if I lived in a land where there is no hero and no man." They stole the other, and she upbraided her husband again. Then Pururavas looked, and said, "How can that be a land without heroes or men where I am?" and naked he sprang up; he thought it too long to put on his dress. Then the Gandhavas sent a flash of lightning, and Urvasi saw her husband naked as by daylight: then she vanished. The same feature appears in the tale of "Melusina and Count Raymond of Toulouse," and even in "Cupid and Psyche," with a variation of the means by which the separation follows on the look. Mr. Morris's story of the *Land East of the Sun and West of the Moon* has many points of resemblance to these tales. "They are, perhaps, the most complicated of myths. Images drawn from myths of day and night are mingled with notions supplied by myths of summer and winter."

But after all the distinguishing characteristic of Orpheus is that he is the greatest of musicians, the harper whom none can resist. This feature is taken from the whispering breeze of early morn, preceding the sunrise. Its more direct Greek representative is Hermeias, the Hellenic form of the Sarameya of the Veda. But Orpheus is more completely the whistling wind, Hermes is rather the playful breeze. There is much to connect the Ribhus with the winds, though Ribhu is a name of the sun. Indeed the tale of "Memnon" shows the close association of the sunrise with the music of the wind. It is wonderful how widespread, under one form or another, is the idea of the irresistible singer or musician. The Sirens are familiar to all. Their contest with Orpheus is a curious instance of collision between two forms of one type. "The Piper,"\* whose half-frolicsome deeds at Hamelin are so amusingly told by Mr. Browning, and whose other adventures are given by Mr. Baring Gould; the story of "The Jew among the Thorns;" Grimm's tales of "The Wonderful Musician," of "Roland and the Witch," and "The Valiant Tailor and the Bear;" the tale of "Arion;" "Bosi's Feats with Sigurd's Harp;" "The Lyre of Glenkundie," and "The Irish Maurice Connor;" "The Lyre given by the Ghost of Zorayhayda to the Rose of the Alhambra;" "The Harp of Wäinämöinen," and, in an inverted form, "The Monk and the Bird," are but a few of its multitudinous appearances.

---

\* Mr. Cox ingeniously suggests that the mysterious epithet of the "Sminthian" Apollo betrays the presence in Greek myth of the rats and mice that play so important a part in Northern tales.



"It comes before us again in the story of 'Jack and the Beanstalk,' in which the giant, who in the un-Christianised myth was Wuotan himself, possessed an enchanted harp, bags of gold and diamonds, and a hen which daily laid a golden egg. 'The harp,' says Mr. Gould, 'is the wind; the bags are the clouds, dropping the sparkling rain; and the golden egg laid every morning by the red hen is the dawn-produced sun.'

"Still more remarkable is the connection of this mystic harp in the legend of Gunadhya with a myth which reproduces that of the Sibylline books. In the Eastern tale the part of Tarquin is played by King Satavahana, to whom Gunadhya sends a poem of seven hundred thousand slokas, written in his own blood. This poem the king rejects, as written in the Pisachia dialect. Gunadhya then burns a portion of his poem on the top of a mountain, but while it is being consumed his song brings together all the beasts of the forest, who weep for joy at the beauty of his tale. The king falls ill, and is told that he must eat game, but none is to had, for all the beasts are listening to Gunadhya. On hearing this news, the king hastens to the spot and buys the poem, or rather the seventh portion, which now alone remained of the whole. It is scarcely necessary to add that in this tale, as in that of 'Wäinämöinen,' we have two stories which must be traced to a common source with the myths of Hermes, Orpheus, and the Sibyl; in other words, to a story, the framework of which had been put together before the separation of the Aryan tribes."—Vol. ii. p. 247.

It would be very interesting to follow Mr. Cox through his analysis of other myths, as he establishes countless unthought-of minute resemblances between Greek and other stories. We have spoken in the main of sun-myths, but it is a mistake (arising, probably, from the fragmentary nature of Max Müller's work on the subject) to suppose that everything is reduced to a solar origin. Mr. Cox has analysed the lunar and earth myths, of which Pan and Demeter may be taken as representatives. The fire, the lightning, the waters, the clouds, the under world and the darkness have each a separate treatment as sources of mythology. It is with reluctance that we omit fuller reference to his delightful pages on the common nursery tales of our race, where he shows how that much is to be traced to a germ in natural phenomena. How, for instance, the idea of a marriage with a frog, or some other loathly creature, which turns out to be a prince or a fairy, is taken from the conception of the sun sinking into and resting for a moment on the water, as a frog or a fish. The story appears in India, in the tale of "Bueki." But it is time to deal with what is, perhaps, the most startling and most valuable, as it is the most original, part of Mr.

Cox's work. Not only are the gods, demi-gods, and fairies from a physical source, but, says he, the "Iliad," and all its kindred stories in other lands, is at bottom a magnificent solar epic.

We cannot do more than very briefly summarise the chief of the vast mass of arguments that Mr. Cox brings to the establishment of his thesis and the demolition of the last stronghold of Euemerism. With the more strictly Homeric controversy we have not to do. The personality of Homer, and the antiquity of "Iliad" and "Odyssey," in anything like their present shape, are quite untouched by the rise or fall of the solar theory. With these, as with other myths, the comparative science gives account only of the origin, and not—or but indirectly—of the after-growth of the materials. Influences the most numerous and diversified must have been at work through a period of indefinite length before the master-pieces of literature grew out of the rude germ sown by the Aryan people in their common Aryan home.

The tale of "Troy" is made up of a great number of earlier mythical narratives, welded together into a whole so complex that, in the utter forgetfulness of the real meaning of these stories, much confusion has inevitably arisen. Paris, who is the real hero, has throughout a two-fold aspect. In the one he is Alexandros, the helper of men. His birth and childhood are marked by the familiar incidents. The threatened ruin of his father's house; the exposure of the infant; his growing up into the mighty hero; his love for Oinone;\* his desertion of her for Helene, for whom he makes the Western journey; the war in which Paris (in spite of the representation of our "Iliad") is the bulwark of Ilion; his inaction as he sits moodily in his chamber while the Trojans are destroyed before their foes; his reappearance to fight with the arrows that shall slay the great Achilles; his protection by Apollo; his wounding, and the return at his death of the lost Oinone of his youth: all these things point irresistibly to the solar hero. But there is another side: he is Paris, the robber. His name occurs in the Veda in a story which is plainly the first trait of the Iliad. The Panis, the robber powers of darkness, have stolen the herds of Indra. He sends Sarama, the morning light, whose name transliterates in Helene, to seek them. The Panis won her to stay with them, and for a moment she consents, but recovering

---

\* Oinone, the daughter of Kebren (the same word as Severn), is, like Aphrodite and Athene, one of the bright beings who sprang from the waters.

herself, returns to Indra. In the unsuccessful wooer of Sarama, we have the successful wooer of Helene. In the robbers who carry off the cattle of Indra, we have the thief who takes the treasure of Menelaos, those riches which are as much the cause of quarrel as the beauty of Helene. The lost treasure is, again, the Golden Fleece that causes the other great gathering of the heroes for the other great Eastern voyage. Helene is the daughter of Zeus, the sister of the transparent Dioskouroi, an altogether unhuman personage—born from the egg, ruined by the golden apple—that appears in so many stories. The myth of her recovery is twice repeated on Greek soil by Theseus; and by Idas and Lynceus she is stolen, as by Paris. The beautiful stranger who beguiles the young wife in her husband's absence is seen again in Ischys, who takes the place of Phoibos in the story of "Koronis," and in the disguised Kephalos, who overcomes the faith of Prokris.

We have then Paris, the solar hero, and Paris, the dark robber. In his latter character he is the great opponent of Achilleus, the hero of the Greek side of the story. Achilleus is the hero without whom Iliou cannot be taken. He is fighting not in his own cause. His story is that of the sun-god. The child of Thetis, the favourite of Athene, the short-lived glorious one who is to fall in the western gate. His wrath and sullen withdrawal is paralleled, not merely in the inaction of Paris, but in the whole tale of Meleagros. He wields the spear that none can lift. His chariot is drawn by immortal horses sprung from the winds. The light that plays above his head makes him unarmed the terror of a host. He, too, must love, and lose his love. Briseïs \* must go, and a maiden from Western Lesbos take her place. In the war of the elements that takes up so much of the twenty-first book, it is hard not to see the struggle of the sun against his watery foes, whom he hardly overcomes with the aid of the fire. The death of Achilleus is a blaze of expiring splendour followed by darkness and storm.

There are countless little things we cannot give that go to swell the mass of cumulative evidence. It must suffice to point out how the scene is Iliou, the city that rose to the music of Phoibos—"a cloud that gathered shape;" how the ten years of the war answer to the ten hours of darkness from the vanishing of Helene to the sun's victory; how solar powers are mixed up in inferior positions; Memnon, for whom

\* Briseis is a patronymic to the Greeks, and Briseus a mere inference from it. But in the Veda, Brisaya occurs as a foe conquered by Indra.

Eos weeps tears of dew ; Sarpedon, the dearest son of Zeus, who falls far from his Lykian home in Western Troy ; Æneas, the wanderer of the west, who is to leave Dido, as Ariadne and Medeia are left ; Rhesos, the driver of the wondrous horses ; Odysseus, the wanderer, and like Philoktetes, the shooter of the unerring poisoned arrows. Nor can we omit Mr. Cox's suggestion that the unique character of Hektor arises from his being drawn from human life, and not one whose deeds are determined by his solar origin.

Over and above these internal indications is the evidence derived from the fact that the "*Iliad*" does not stand alone. Scandinavian, Teuton, Kelt, Frank, and Saxon have their own epics in which the solar element is as apparent as in Homer. Their constantly recurring likeness to the Greek in the midst of so marked an originality, points irresistibly to a common source. They are too original to have been copied or borrowed, even were such a thing possible. There is too much likeness to be the result of accident, whether in the independent creations of poets' brains, or in the course of actual occurrences. The Northern stories have had a thousand years more than the Greek to develop in. They have grown up among the snows of subarctic regions, or in the wild forests of Germany. It is, therefore, but to be expected that they will differ widely from the forms assumed by the common germs in the sunny lands of the South and East. So their whole spirit is more savage. Those terrible incidents that, in Greek myth, shock all the more for the contrast with the general air of gentle beauty, are the very atmosphere of the *Volsung* and *Nibelungen* tales. These were arrested in their savage stage by an imported civilisation and a religion whose tendency was to condemn and banish them, while the Greek legends shared like other things in the softening influence of native refinement.

The compass of the northern story answers rather to the "*Epic Cycle*" of Greece than to the "*Iliad*." The tale flows on from generation to generation as the wheel of fate revolves, and ends at last simply because it cannot go on for ever. The hero of each narrative is transparently the solar god struggling with varied success against his powerful foes. The stolen treasure, and the baneful beauty of a woman ; the jealousy of the successive loves of the hero ; the wholesale massacre that marks the crowning vengeance, constantly recur as the turning points of the story. It would take too long to unfold the whole Epos. We can only give single specimens that must suffice for the character of the whole.

The story of Sigmund, the first Volsung hero, whose tale is told at length, is full of little incidents, that do not affect the course of the plot, which call up similar features in the myths of other lands. The whole train is set in motion by the apple that Ljod gives to Rerir, the father of Volsung. The hall of Volsung is built like that of Odysseus, round a mighty tree that he will not remove. The birth of Sigmund, from a mother who never sees him, is that of Dionysos, of Vikramaditya, and in the main of Rustem; the one-eyed Odin recalls the Kyklops and the one-handed Indra Savitar; the sword Gram, which he fixes in Branstock, whence none but Sigmund can remove it, is the same that Theseus takes from under the stone, and that shows Arthur's right to the kingdom; the quarrel of Siggeir and Sigmund, and the defeat of the latter, is the temporary bondage of Phoibos and Herakles. Sigmund is saved by his sister Signy, whose relations with him repeat the unnatural acts of the Greek heroines, in which he is, like Oidipous, the unwilling partner. The familiar parricide appears faintly in the fruitless design to slay Siggeir by means of his son. The life of Sigmund and Sinfjotli, as were-wolves, is the old, wide-spread superstition of Lykanthropy, the strangest form of the belief in the Lykeian god. The burying alive of Sigmund is the strongest mythical putting of the sun's disappearance. When he and Sinfjotli attack alone the host of Siggeir that holds their home, and eats up their substance, we cannot but see the story of Odysseus and Telemachos. The burning of the hall, and all within it, is a more strictly solar vengeance than that of the Ithakan chief: his calm old age is reflected in Sigmund, and his death in battle at last. The yielding up of the sword is seen again in Arthur. Sigmund dies in the arms of Hjordis, as Paris in Oinone's; but he leaves her the mother of the unborn Sigurd, who is to repeat his father's greatness. All these points of resemblance are contained in the first fifty pages of Mr. Morris's translation. It surely needs no more to prove the close connection of the Northern sagas with the common Aryan epic.

The story of Sigurd and Fafnir is as pregnant with physical meaning as any of the labours of Herakles. Fafnir is the Python of the north. The two names are related as  $\theta\eta\rho$  to  $\phi\eta\rho$ . He appears to represent the malignant power of the earth that steals Brynhild (the summer) and her treasure, and guards them with barriers of ice and volcanic fire. Thus he is the brother of Regin, the smith of the race of the dwarfs, as the metal-working, wealth-giving earth-powers are the

brothers of the malignant ones. They are, therefore, at deadly feud with each other. The feud arose because Fafnir unjustly kept the treasure of the dwarf Andvari, paid by the gods of heaven to the brothers, as fine for the death of their brother, the otter slain by Loki. Loki and his comrades were bound by Fafnir and Regin, and pledged to cover the white otter's skin with gold; in other words, to hide all traces of the icy-time beneath the riches of spring and summer. But all the wealth of Andvari cannot avail to cover one particular hair which, like the last head of the Hydra, baffles all efforts. These things shadow forth the impossibility of utterly overcoming the winter. It will come up again. At last it is covered by the charmed ring that grows other rings. The self-producing power of winter is balanced by the same power in summer. Fafnir keeps the whole treasure, and Regin, years after, incites Sigurd to slay the dragon. He forges him two swords, which are shivered at a blow; for the subterranean fire cannot avail in this contest. The fragments of Gram are then welded together again, and Sigurd, girt with the weapon of Apollo Chrysaor, engages and destroys the monster.

The incidents, and many of the names of the Volsunga saga, are repeated with more or less variation in all the branches of the Northern people. "The Beowulf," "The Nibelungen Lied," the story of "Walthar of Aquitaine," and of "Dietrich of Berne," are but varieties of the common tale, not independent growths from the common germs. The curious introduction of historic names into the *Nibelungen Lied*, and the strong influence of Christianity upon it, make it very interesting as throwing light upon mythical growth; but we need not tarry over it. Nor can we dwell on the everywhere apparent traces of the traditional materials in the Arthurian epic, with its weakling hero growing into the mighty king, the wielder of the resistless sword; its most glorious exalting of the search for the lost treasure into the "Quest of the Sancgreal;" its tragedy of the faithless Guinevere, and the war for her recovery; its terrible final slaughter, and the disappearance of the dying king only to come again.

There is, however, one Keltic story which shall be given at length, both as being little known, and as combining, in a marvellous way, the most striking features of the Volsung tale and the Iliad. It is the story of Conall Gulban.

"The materials of which it is made up carry us to a vast number of legends in Aryan mythology; but the main story is that of



Herakles, Achilleus, and Helen. Conall himself is the solar hero, despised at first for his homely appearance and seeming weakness, but triumphant in the end over all his enemies. Nay, as he becomes an idiot in the 'Lay of the Great Fool,' so here he is emphatically Analkis, the coward. But he is resolved, nevertheless, to make the daughter of the King of Laidheann his wife, although, like Brynhild and Briar Rose, and Surya Abai, she is guarded within barriers which the knight who would win her must pass at the cost of his life, if he fails. The fortress had a great wall with iron spikes, within a foot of each other, and a man's head upon every spike but the one which had been left for his own. It is the hedge of spears of the modern Hindoo legends, the fiery circle which Sigurd must enter to waken the maiden who sleeps within it. As he draws nigh to the barrier, one of the soldiers says, 'I perceive that thou art a beggar who was in the land of Eirinn. What wrath would the King of Laidheann have if he should come and find his daughter shamed by any one coward of Eirinn?' At a window in this fastness stands the Breast of Light, the Helen of the tale. 'Conall stood a little while gazing at her, but at last he put his palm on the point of his spear, he gave his rounded spring, and he was in at the window beside the Breast of Light'—a name which recalls the *Europé*, *Euryganeia*, and *Euryphassa* of Hellenic myths. The maiden bids him not make an attempt which must end in his death; but he leaps over the heads of the guards. 'Was not that the hero and the worthy wooer, that his like is not to be found to-day?' Yet she is not altogether pleased that it is 'the coward of the great world' that has taken her away; but Conall is preparing to take a vengeance like that of *Odysseus*, and all the guards and warriors are slain. The insult is wiped out in blood; but, with marvellous fidelity to the old mythical phrases, Conall is made to tell Breast of Light 'that he had a failing; every time that he did any deed of valour, he must sleep before he could do brave deeds again.' The sequel is as in the 'Lay of the Great Fool.' *Paris* comes while *Menelaos* slumbers, or heeds him not, or is absent. He has a mirror in his ship which will rise up for none but the daughter of the King of Laidheann, and as it rises for her, he knows that he has found the fated sister of the *Dioskouroi*, and with her he sails straightway for his home across the sea. But the seducer has sworn to leave her free for a year and a day, if Conall has so much courage as to come in pursuit of her. Like Helen, she is shut up in the robber's stronghold, 'sorrowful that so much blood was being spilt for her;' but Conall conquers in the struggle, and rescues her 'out of the dark place in which she was.' Then follow more wanderings, answering to the *Nostoi*, and, like *Odysseus*, Conall appears in worn-out clothes in order to make his way into the king's fortress, and again a scene of blood ensues, as in the hall of slaughter in the courts of the *Ithakan* and *Burgundian* chieftains. The story now repeats itself. The King of the Green Isle has a daughter who, like

Danaë, is shut up in a tower, and the other warriors try in vain to set her free. Conall overthrows the tower, and Sunbeam came out, the daughter of the King of the Green Isle, and she clasped her two arms about the neck of Conall, and Conall put his two arms about Sunbeam, and he bore her into the great house and said to the king, 'Thy daughter is won.' The myth is transparent. Sunbeam would marry Conall, but he tells her that he is already wedded to the Breast of Light, and she becomes the wife of Mac-a-Moir the Great Hero, the son of the King of Light."—*Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, vol. ii. pp. 157-9.

This constant recurrence of the same incidents in the tales of India and of Iceland, of Western Scotland and of Greece, of Keltic Britain and its Saxon conquerors, tells its own story. Wherever the branches of the Aryan race are found, there also is found the Aryan mythology. In spite of differences of form, such as are to be expected from the moulding of Ionian rhapsodists, of Keltic bards, and of Norse skalds, the materials of all are evidently the same, and these materials are preserved to us in the incoherent phrases of the Vedic hymns.

---

- ART. V.—1. *Histoire de Napoléon I.* Par P. LANFREY. Quatrième Edition. Paris: Charpentier. 1870.
2. *Napoléon I<sup>er</sup>.* Par JULES BARNI. Paris: Baillière. 1870.
3. *Le Conscriit, Waterloo, Histoire d'un Paysan, &c.* Par ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN. Paris: Hetzel. 1869.
4. *Waterloo; Etude de la Campagne de 1815.* Par le LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRINCE ÉDOUARD DE LA TOUR D'AUVERGNE. Paris: Henri Plon. 1870.
5. *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire.* Par M. THIERS. Paris: 1854. (Translation: Willis and Sotheran. London. 1862.)
6. *The Field of Waterloo.* By LIEUTENANT-COLONEL CHESNEY, ex-Professor at Sandhurst. London. 1868.

It was natural that the unpopularity of the Second Empire should be reflected on the founder of the dynasty. Frenchmen are, so to speak, chartered turn-coats. Fickleness which, in an Englishman, would be immoral—which to some Frenchmen becomes so unendurable that it drives them, as it probably drove poor M. Prévost-Paradol, to suicide—is, in the mass of the nation, held to be graceful. They change their heroes as they change their fashions, or rather they accept no hero as a finality. France is their one engrossing idea. So long as a man leads France in the way in which she loves to go, he is accepted; but when he ceases to do so, he is sooner or later doomed. We, with our widely different temperament, call this ingratitude: it is not, it is simply the over-mastering passion for national greatness which leads Frenchmen to merge, not only their own individuality, but also that of others, in the effort to keep France at the head of Europe. Opposites often,—nay, almost always,—meet in the same character; and when we remember that the feeling which we have tried to define is combined in most Frenchmen with a more than ordinary share of vanity, we see how it is that the god of a Frenchman's idolatry stands on a less secure pedestal than the idol of most masses of men.

Writers, of course, strive hard against this feeling. It is unsentimental; it seems so like a worship of success:—which it is not; for if the hero is true to French traditions, he may weather through a great deal of disaster. The one thing

which shows how thoroughly Napoleon I. had identified himself with French national life is the way in which the poets clung to him in disaster. Béranger, who could mock at his politics, and ridicule his court in verses which everybody enjoyed, wrote the *Souvenirs du Peuple*, the spirit of which is that—

“Tout bien qu'il nous ait nui,  
Le peuple encor le révère.”

And Victor Hugo, in his *Lui*, makes quite a glorified martyr of the captious, fretful occupant of Longwood, who—

“Mourant de l'exil géné dans Saint-Hélène,  
Manque d'air dans la cage où l'exposent les rois ;”

and takes occasion, from the *Memoirs*, and from Barry O'Meara's cantankerous *Voice from St. Helena*, to give vent to a burst of indignation against England and her “geôliers vils comme un vil criminel.” When Napoleon was taken out of the way, the literary men, following, and not leading, began to recognise how strong a hold he had once had on the public mind, and to try to shame their countrymen into, at any rate, sentimental consistency. It would not do: with admirable oneness of purpose, the little and the middling, quite as much as the great men, bowed to the rising star, and Bonapartism became a name until the follies of the restored Bourbons gave it something like a bodily existence. We know what happened then: there was no man ready to give new life to the decaying party. In 1830, Charles Louis, Queen Hortense's son, baptised in 1810 by Cardinal Fesch, with the Emperor and Marie-Louise for his sponsors, and presented to the army by his uncle on the return from Elba as one who might well play Octavius to his Julius Cæsar, was living by the Lake of Thun, studying engineering and gunnery, and going on Alpine tours. He was then rather more than twenty-two years old; and, doubtless, he judged that not only the dying out of Bonapartist feeling, but also the fact that the Duke of Reichstadt (who did not die for some years after) was the head of the House, were enough to ruin his chance of profiting by the expulsion of the elder Bourbons. Anyhow, he remained quiet, asking permission to serve as a common soldier in the French army; a request to which Louis Philippe replied by renewing the decree of perpetual banishment against the whole Bonaparte family. Then came the affair of Rome, in which Charles Louis, the exile, fought on the side which Louis Napoleon the Emperor has so

persistently opposed; and then, in 1836, began that series of attempts on France which ended in making him, first Prince-President, and then Emperor, with the whole nation (except a few irreconcilables) at his feet.

For this revulsion of feeling, which made a peasantry that had been ready in 1814 to tear the First Emperor in pieces, as he was running off to Elba, vote *en masse* for his nephew, simply because that nephew bore the name of Napoleon, France has, no doubt, to thank her writers. First, slowly following public opinion, they blossomed out into a sentimental Bonapartism when the feeling was dying away among people in general; next, anticipating the change which was sure to come under rulers like Louis XVIII. and Charles X., they led the way to a fresh Napoleon worship, in which (when it was developed) they themselves could by no means be persuaded to join. Political disappointments and wounded vanity, combined with the national weakness for anything overpoweringly vast, made sentimental Bonapartists of a whole school of men of whom M. Victor Hugo is the best living type. These men bred up in the heart of a nation a feeling to which the revolutionary follies of 1848 gave great practical effect. But when the *coup d'état* came, the sentimental Imperialists loudly disowned their own work; and *Napoleon le Petit* is the first of a whole chorus of outcry, which, beginning with wild screams of defiance, has gradually shaped itself into steady-going history. The present school of anti-Bonapartists aim higher than M. Victor Hugo. Passing the nephew by in silence, they strive to show that, in all that makes man really great, the uncle was as deficient as it was possible for man to be; that, though he fought sixty battles (Cæsar only fought fifty), and won splendid victories, his was essentially a petty mind. Of course, such writers cannot be patriotic, except in a very strange sense; if Napoleon was a mean, low-minded man, so much the worse for that French character which he undoubtedly dominated in such a remarkable manner. You do not exalt the victim by depreciating the power that has fascinated or quelled it. If it is a sufficient answer to the question, "Why did Bonaparte take such precedence in public opinion over men like Hoche, Moreau, and Massena?" to reply, "Que voulez-vous? ceux-là n'étaient pas des comédiens, et les Français aiment les comédiens," all we can say is, that the man who utters such a sentiment takes a lower view than we do of the character of his nation. This is the weakness of the irreconcilable school: in attacking the Second Empire through the First, they are obliged to exaggerate the national failings.

They are worse off than M. Beulé, who, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, has, with such cruel (because such covert) satire, made the vices of the Cæsars illustrate the evils of Imperialism as it is. He is merely culling from Suetonius or Juvenal, and laying bare the social infamies of heathen Italians. They tell us of France degraded, cowed, dragged along at the chariot-wheel of a Corsican, losing not only the moral results, but even the material gains which the old revolution had brought her, because the man who held her in thrall refused to make peace, and sacrificed her to his mad dreams of self-aggrandisement and universal dominion. "In the wars of the Republic we made real conquests. Austria and Prussia attacked us unjustly, and we beat them, and the Austrian Netherlands, and all the left bank of the Rhine, became ours by treaty; and the loss of all this we owe to Bonaparte's transcendent genius." Of course, M. Lanfrey and his school vent their wrath mainly upon M. Thiers, who, among prose writers, has done more than anyone to re-establish Napoleonism. Why M. Thiers should have acted in this way it is hard to tell. No doubt he is conscientious; his conduct since the *coup d'état* proves this beyond question. Is he so terrified at the phantom of red-republicanism (that *spectre rouge*, the dread of which overthrew the republic of '48), that he thinks Cæsarism should be glorified in order that its implacable antagonist may be the more readily abased? or was he merely supporting a thesis, and trying how noble a romance could be made out of the history of the Consulate and Empire? M. Barni, when he published, at Geneva, that *Napoléon et son Historien M. Thiers*, of which the little work named at the head of this paper is a popular abridgment, assumes that M. Thiers' book is a romance like the history of Cyrus, the hero of which is an impossible compound of super-human perfections; and, certainly, if M. Thiers closes his work with the warning, "Napoleon's life teaches us that we ought never to abandon our country to the power of one man, no matter who he may be, no matter under what circumstances," he nevertheless leaves the door half-open for future *coups d'état* by confessing that, "if any nation ever had an excuse for placing itself in the power of one man, it was France, when, in 1800, she adopted Napoleon as her chief. It was no pretended anarchy that was raised as a bugbear to terrify the nation into chains. . . ." This is the sort of language on which M. Victor Hugo pours his scathing indignation in *Napoléon le Petit*, when he says, "Depuis tel banquier juif quise sentait un peu catholique jusqu'à tel évêque qui se sentait un peu juif, tous les hommes du passé



se recraient contre le spectre rouge." And this is just the point which M. Lanfrey and his school have to prove—that the 18th Brumaire was a scandalous and also an unnecessary outrage on the Constitution by its sworn defender; that instead of crushing liberty, the First Consul was, of all men, bound to have guided it to a right issue. Many subsidiary questions come out in which MM. Lanfrey, Barni, &c., are wholly at variance with M. Thiers. Even in this matter of military genius, they describe him as rather an adept at availing himself of other men's abilities than as himself gifted with that wondrous skill which his panegyrists and the world at large ascribe to him. Putting out of sight the wonderful campaign of 1814, when the Emperor, with a handful of men, half of them raw recruits, half worn-out veterans, turned defensive war into offensive, and surprised and overwhelmed in turn both Blücher and Schwartzberg, they make a strong point of his usual impatience of reverse, of the facility with which he usually left his troops to take care of themselves and went off at the first disaster, and of the monotony with which he worked his one great weapon of offence, destroying the combinations of his adversaries by concentrating great masses of troops on one point. When this failed him, he had (we are told) nothing else to fall back upon. The fact is, that between the young and brilliant strategist, who conquered Italy in 1797 and in 1800, and who, in 1805, marched in a fortnight from Flanders to Suabia, turning all the defiles of the Black Forest, and forcing 60,000 men to surrender *en masse*—between this leader and the man of Spain and Russia and Leipzig and Waterloo, there is a vast difference. In the one there is a genius fertile and full of resource; in the other the stubbornness of infatuation.

Waterloo has been so criticised by Colonel Charras, M. Quinet, and others, that the Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne is forced to come to the rescue and to save Bonaparte from the charge of fatuousness in leaving a great part of his army idle all day, by laying the blame on Grouchy's failing to send any despatches. No one, except an "irreconcilable," can dispute Bonaparte's title to the very highest rank among military geniuses; but no one, except a Bonapartist, will deny (what the Prince de la Tour himself freely admits) that towards the end of his career he made many and grievous blunders; accustomed to guide circumstances, he could not understand that a change as thorough as that of which the Tugendbund and the gathering of the German peoples was the sign, necessitated a thorough change in his own conduct. His stubbornness ruined him;

and he whom his nephew styles "one of those bright beacon-lights which disperse the darkness of their own age, and cast a radiance on the future," went out in darkness and gloom, and has left it a question even among Frenchmen whether he was not rather a baleful rather than a salutary light. So much to show the position taken up by the authors of the different books of which we have given the names. M. Lanfrey's is an elaborate work, in six volumes, written in a studiously dispassionate style, which, however, after affecting for many pages the impartiality of a Hallam, suddenly changes, for a few lines, to cutting sarcasm or impassioned invective. M. Barni lays no claim to impartiality. He is the opponent of M. Thiers, and holds a brief for the irreconcilables. Colonel Chesney's views are adopted from Colonel Charras, on whose book his work is based. The Erekmann-Châtian tales are intensely national, but at the same time thoroughly Republican. The feeling of the writers is the same as that of their school—that Bonaparte acted on the 18th Brumaire in a wholly unjustifiable way. At the same time, the lively picture which they draw of Republican disorders, and of the failure of the Directory, shows that something must have been done, and that the Consul was only able to succeed owing to the utter weariness with which the self-seeking greed and pretentious imbecility of men like Barras had filled men's minds. Lastly, the monograph of the Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne is a protest, on the Imperialist side, against the attacks of this opposite party on Napoleon's military genius. "Separate war and politics," says the Prince: "as a statesman he may have been all that you say he was; but as a general, I undertake to prove that he was peerless."

The strangest thing about Bonaparte's career is that he began as a professed patriot, long before he deemed it necessary for his advancement that he should "hold on to the skirts of the Robespierres." At eleven years old, when he entered the school at Brienne, he burst into a torrent of invective on seeing the portrait of Choiseul, "the man who had enslaved his island." And, later in life, when he spoke of his dead father, he used to say he could never forgive him for not having shared the exile of Paoli. He was probably cured of whatever "patriotism" he may have picked up as a boy, brought up among Paoli's adherents, by the trials which followed his father's death. The Bonapartes were left very poorly off; the children were placed out in the various royal foundations then open to young people of noble blood, and the young patriot soon found that universal philanthropy is

reconcilable with a complete disregard for the calls of friendship and of kindred. Under this pressure his gloominess increased; the savage disposition of the Corsican seemed to overmaster that Italian subtlety which he owed to his Florentine extraction. He had always been hard to manage, as Duchesne says, in his beautiful little poem:—

“ L'écolier

Etait du petit nombre ardent et difficile à se plier,  
Enthusiaste et fier, comme on l'est à son âge dans le midi.”

Whether the enthusiasm was assumed or not (and we hold it was not, for enthusiasm and selfishness are not at all incompatible), the ill temper was not. At the Paris Military School (1785) he got a character for misanthropy. Even at Valence, where he was sent on garrison duty as second lieutenant (1786), and where (says M. Lanfrey) “he was suddenly introduced into that world of the old régime,—a world made by women and for women,—and was taken in hand by one of the most distinguished ladies of the time,” his cynicism may be judged of from his *Dialogue sur l'Amour*: “Love (he says) does more harm than good, and it would be a blessing if some protecting deity would deliver men from it altogether.” At this time came on those thoughts of suicide which have been so often commented on; he despaired of Corsica; “My countrymen lick the hand that oppresses them. They are no longer worthy of the Corsican name. . . . Frenchmen, not content with having wrested from us all that we hold dear, you have moreover corrupted our morals. . . . Life is a burden to me because those with whom I live, and shall probably always live, are as different from me in ways and thoughts as moonlight is from sunlight. I cannot make up my mind to follow the only way of life which, in my present surroundings, could make life endurable.”\* Here is that same scorn of men which afterwards led him not only into such reckless undertakings, but into such terrible mistakes coming out under another form. Feeling himself so different from the elegant triflers among whom he began life, he seems to have wrapped himself up in dreams of Corsican greatness. At Valence he began a history of the island, and in 1786 wrote a letter dedicating his work to Abbé Raynal. To carry out what Paoli had planned seemed to him, at that time, the height of human ambition. Paoli had hoped that in 1789 the

\* Libri, *Souvenirs de la Jeunesse de Bonaparte*. M. Lanfrey says Libri is an irrefragable authority. The Baron de Coston, the Duchesse d'Abrantes, and other writers on the same subject, he holds very cheap.

French Liberals would have proved their liberality by freeing Corsica. They did not do so; and Bonaparte, who was with Paoli in the island in 1790, accepted the inevitable, and set up for chef de bataillon in the National Guard of Ajaccio. This, the highest military post in the Island, was sought by several candidates. By dint of money, promises, menaces, and family influence, worked to the uttermost, the young Bonaparte got a great number of the electors to support him; but the important thing was to gain the Commissioners appointed by the Constituent Assembly to organise the battalions. Of these Murati was the chief; and he had, without declaring his preference, taken up his quarters with Peraldi, the most formidable of Bonaparte's competitors. The young lieutenant acted with a promptitude worthy of the *coup d'état*. One evening, when the Peraldis were at table, there came a knock at the door; armed men rushed in and seized Murati, who had run off the moment he saw them. They carried him to Bonaparte, who received him with a smile, and said, "Allow me to offer you my house; I'm quite certain that you could not feel as free as you ought to be in Peraldi's house." Here is the germ of that which showed itself in the outrage on the 18th Brumaire, upon the five hundred, in the seizure of the Duke d'Enghien, of bookseller Palm, and of the Spanish king and his son, and in so many of those lawless acts at which Bonaparte never hesitated for an instant.

Then came the stirring scenes of the Revolution, which Bonaparte was able to view as a spectator: a great advantage for one who wished to profit by what was happening. He soon made up his mind that France, not Corsica, must help him to move the world. Combined with an intense scorn of the common people (he talks to Bourienne of his wish *balayer toute cette canaille*), he showed a decided preference for French institutions, and in 1792 he quarrelled with Paoli for remaining firm in those ideas of independence which he himself had in his earlier days so strongly advocated. Getting up a conspiracy to seize the citadel of Ajaccio for the French, he was declared a traitor to his country, and with much difficulty made his escape to the mainland, accompanied by his mother and all the family. He next took a part in the overthrow of the Girondins, by publishing (in July 1793) his *Souper de Beaucaire*, a work of which the stilted style is not so offensive as the cynical disregard for high principle. He always used to aver that while the struggle was going on all his sympathies were with the Girondins. "The Girondins (he argues) ought to have given in, because they could not

have stood their ground without exciting a civil war. . . . Had they merited their reputation, they would have given in when they saw how things were—they would have sacrificed their interests to the public good; but it is always easier to quote the case of Decius than to imitate him." Here is (remarks M. Lanfrey) our theory of *faits accomplis* already fully developed. The Girondins represented the legal Government against which the majority of the Convention plotted in a very base way; but, because the mountain had proved itself the stronger, the young Corsican declares that to support the mountain is the duty of all good citizens. The character with which the future Emperor begins his public career is completed by his treatment of his former idol Paoli. Not content with throwing him over when he saw that France was determined not to leave Corsica independent, he vilified him, accused him of having "deceived the people, crushed the true friends of liberty, drawn away the islanders into mad and criminal projects, pillaged stores, &c., &c.;" used towards him, in fact, the same coarse vituperation which he afterwards used indiscriminately towards great and small, towards Pitt as well as Rodio.

The siege of Toulon raised Bonaparte considerably in public estimation (not that he, elected, by whatever means, Captain-General of Corsican militia, had been even before that a wholly insignificant person). But, though the mountain thought it worth their while to pay court to him, he was far from attaching himself irrevocably to the mountain. After Toulon, he was employed to put the Provençal coast into a state of defence, and then he went on to Nice, the headquarters of old Dumerbion and the French army. Here, by his wonderful power of gaining the ascendancy over men, he soon became practically the chief, ruling not only the incapable old general, but the Commissioner from Paris, the younger Robespierre, with whom he struck up a very close friendship. Employing the able Massena as his second in command, he gave the Austro-Piedmontese a series of defeats, and gained the defiles of the Alps from the Col di Tende to Bardinetto. Young Robespierre wrote such glowing accounts of the new commander that Maximilian, feeling that a struggle with the Committees of Sections was imminent, and knowing the incapacity of Henriot, who commanded the army of Paris, sent for Bonaparte to replace him. He declined to go, and young Robespierre, summoned to help his brother, had to start without him whom he had spoken of as *notre homme, notre faiseur de plans*. Bonaparte's refusal nearly ruined him; three

Commissioners—Salicetti, Laporte, and Albitte—came down to the Italian army; and while Laporte put him under arrest, his countryman Salicetti was urgent for him to be sent up to Paris to take his trial before the Committee of Public Safety. At one moment it seemed inevitable either that he should be sent off to almost certain death, or should break away with the young officers (Junot, Marmont, and others, who were indignant at his arrest, and had formed a plan for carrying him off by main force), and retire to the Genoese territory. The death of Robespierre, and the destruction of his party, came very opportunely for Bonaparte, who (says M. Lanfrey) took all possible pains to destroy the evidence of his connection with the family. Nevertheless, the fact is fully established, though the sole reference to it, in his own memoirs, is this bit of hypocrisy worthy of Cromwell: "I was somewhat moved by the fate of the younger Robespierre; I loved him, and thought him sound; but had he been my own father, I would myself have run a dagger into his heart if he had sought to make himself a tyrant." Cool and calculating, he did his best to get rid of the suspicion attaching to him as Robespierre's "man," and to convince those in power that he was indispensable, "as being the only man who thoroughly understood the army in Italy." He did not at once succeed; the heads of the anti-terrorist thermidor reaction looked on the army of Italy as a hot-bed of Jacobins, and sought to break up its influence by dispersing its officers. Bonaparte was called to Paris, and, to his great disgust, invested with the command in La Vendée. How he intrigued not to go; how Aubry, who had replaced Carnot at the head of the war department, intrigued against him, moved by the jealousy which an ex-captain of artillery might naturally feel at the rapid advancement of his lieutenant; how Bonaparte escaped a command which was unpleasant and unprofitable,\* and remained hanging about Paris, waiting upon Providence, reduced even to sell his books in those hard times in which the louis d'or was worth 750 paper francs—these things are among the less noticed facts of his earlier career, facts on which we have determined to dwell at some length, both because they are less known, and because they had a considerable influence on Bonaparte's future career.

He was still in Paris when the reaction from the Terror set in; the *jeunesse dorée* began to trim its wings, and society

---

\* It was transferred to the noble and self-denying Hoche, whose mission always seemed to be to win laurels for other men to wear.



seemed determined (as in our own Charles II.'s time) to atone for a temporary restraint by a fit of unbridled luxury. Writing to his brother Joseph (12th July, 1795), he says:—

"The carriages and the fashionable folks are showing again; the time, during which they have ceased to glitter, seems to them nothing but a long dream. Everything is gathered here which can draw a man out of himself, and render life pleasant to him. Amid such a whirl and excitement, such a giving up of the mind to the trifles of the hour, it is impossible to take a gloomy view of things. . . . Woman is everywhere, in the public walks, at the play, in the libraries. Even in the savan's study you catch sight of a pretty face or two. Here, of all places in the world, women ought to be at the helm; they are the objects of an insane worship—men think only of them, and live only for them. A woman ought to be six months in Paris to learn what is her due, and what ought to be her power among men."

During this life in Paris a curious proof comes out how early Bonaparte's views turned to the East; he begged for a mission to Turkey, setting forth the great advantages to be gained from making that empire a strong power, capable of standing against Russia, and of giving France efficient help in her projects on the side of Asia.

Everyone knows the sudden way in which, after long waiting, he secured, mainly by Josephine's influence with Barras, the command in Italy, and began the brilliant campaign which resulted in the total overthrow of Beaulieu, and the submission first of Piedmont and then of Lombardy. Of course he did not effect this without being ably seconded by generals and subalterns. One instance of this is enough. When Beaulieu, and his second in command D'Argenteau (what an idea it gives us of the Frenchification of Europe to find so many French names in foreign services), had arranged to cut off the half of the French army which lay between the Apennines and Genoa, the plan failed through the stubborn bravery of Colonel Rampon, who, with a mere handful of men, held a redoubt in the pass through which D'Argenteau was to advance, and, keeping the whole Austrian division at bay, saved Bonaparte from disgrace.

This campaign, so marked with high military genius, is marred by those exactions and spoliations which soon became proverbial. The letters between Bonaparte and the Directory are always about the amount to be extorted from the conquered (or "liberated") people. "It is revolting," says M. Lanfrey, "to note in how incredibly short a time this intense thirst after the wealth of friendly peoples, and

this cynical shamelessness in laying bare their own greed, had grown upon the men who swayed the destinies of France." Liberty, and all the grand promises made at the Revolution, are never even hinted at; everything is done from a spirit of calculation. Milan, for instance, which had welcomed the French as deliverers, has to pay an enormous subsidy. "Don't spare it," write the Directors; "get large contributions in cash while the fame of your arms is fresh, and, at the same time, arrange for the future." Parma, on the other hand, which had been in the coalition against the French, is let off cheaply *out of consideration for Spain*. "From Rome, if she wants to be friends, the first thing is to exact that public prayers be put up everywhere for the success of our arms; and then a few of her finest antiques, statues, pictures, medals, books, silver madonnas, or even bells, will cover the expense of your visit." Nothing comes amiss to this Directory, which had undertaken (be it remembered) to carry out those principles of '89 which were to regenerate the whole human race; and nothing comes amiss to the greedy generals and commissioners. How a man like Carnot, esteemed a model of probity, could sign such instructions is a marvel; his having done so helps to explain how that fatal contempt for mankind, which afterwards led the Emperor into such ruinous errors, was formed in the young soldier of the Republic. Who was worthy of respect when even Carnot could write like a swindler? \* Thibaudeau is actually indignant that the French artists, and some scientific men (notably the high-minded Quatremère de Quincy), should have had what he calls the ill-conditioned folly to petition against this removal of works of art: "Why, by the laws of Greek and Roman warfare, we might have burned the pictures and broken up the statues," says this model ruler of a civilised (though not at that time a professedly Christian) nation.

Amid all this riot of private greed, it must be remarked that Bonaparte does not appear to have made personal gain his object. He was always very careful of his relations, and his anxiety to give them a large share of all the good things is less praiseworthy than the zeal with which, when in Paris, he worked at the education of his young brother Louis; but valuing money only for the power which it gave, he did not seek to enrich himself as the Directors did, and as Sieyès did,

---

\* Is it the French alliance which has given us a taste for the like looting? The Russian pictures of saints, the plundering of the Summer Palace, and above all, the miserable trappings of the wretched Theodore—these ought not to be in our Kensington Museum.

by stealing. Salicetti, with whom he had patched up a peace, came one day to tempt him. "Here is, in the next room," said he, "the commander of Este, brother of the Duke of Modena, with four millions in gold in four boxes. He comes, in his brother's name, to beg you will accept them. I advise you to do it. You know the pay which these Directors give is miserably small; and they make no provision for their servants. You and I are countrymen; take this, no one will ever be the wiser, and you have a perfect right to it." "Thank you," coldly replied Bonaparte; "I won't, for such a sum, put myself in the Duke of Modena's power." In this reply M. Lanfrey sees not the irony of a man who never lost his temper except advisedly, but a mark of character, "neither indignation nor reproach—cool calculation, that is all." Surely this is too severe; the historian here falls into what, rare with him, is a common error of his school—making too much of petty grievances. It is the universal temptation of a beaten political party; we are, unhappily, too familiar with it in the "national" Irish press: but, fortunately for his readers, M. Lanfrey but seldom gives way to it.

If Bonaparte was not money-loving, he was certainly insincere. We may judge of the value of his bulletins, and his impassioned speeches, from his advice to General Gentili, in Corfu: "If the islanders have a taste for independence, flatter it, and be sure in all your proclamations to talk to them about Greece, Athens, and Rome" (*Correspondence*, May 26, 1797). While bamboozling the Corfiotes, he not only (as we said) made Milan impoverished as it was with five years of war, pay monstrously for the privilege of being told that "the French look on the people of Lombardy as their brothers," but he treated Venice with consummate perfidy. Violating her neutrality at the commencement of his campaign against Wurmser, he wholly ruined her after he had beaten off that general. His conduct during the preliminaries of Leoben, when he hastened on an armistice out of jealousy to Hoche and Moreau, who were on the eve of winning great successes in Germany, and the way in which, at Campo-Formio, in the teeth of the orders of the Directory, he gave up the old mistress of the sea to Austria, throws a great deal of light on his later career. Even Talleyrand did his best to win the general to the wishes of the Directory; but all the answer he got was, "You don't understand this effeminate, superstitious, and cowardly people."

The Directory had advised as strongly as they could; they had talked of "the shame of abandoning Venice, of the

danger of introducing Austria into the heart of the Italian peninsula;" but they had not ordered. They rather dreaded their general, and he despised them accordingly, though he kept his contempt for the present in abeyance. He did just the opposite of what they directed; and in October he signed peace, alleging as his reason the death of Hoche, though Augereau, Hoche's successor, had no enemy between him and the Danube; the weakness of his army, which had never been so strong; and "the sin of wasting French blood in behalf of nations who neither cared for liberty nor were worthy of it, and who from character, habits, and religion, have a profound hatred for us." Peace was made, therefore; and Bonaparte prided himself very much on "coming down, like Cincinnatus, among the common herd, and setting an example of respect for the magistrates and of dislike for that military rule which has ruined so many states" (*Correspondence*, October 10, 1797). Here was dissimulation carried to such a pitch that it ought to have alarmed the Directory; they, however, suspected nothing; and, content with the cession of Belgium and the establishment of the Cisalpine Republic, they abandoned to Austria the whole of the Venetian territory, and broke the heart of Manin, her last doge.

Coming back to Paris, where Talleyrand welcomed him in a speech which called the day of his return "the triumph of equality," and spoke of him as "a stoic hero quite cut off from worldly splendour, and fond of living a simple and obscure life in the midst of his abstruse studies," he gave a significant hint that things were not as he would have them. "When the happiness of France," said he, "*shall be based on better laws*, then all Europe will become free." The Directory distrusted him, and he distrusted them; they showed him the police revelations, which proved that plots were in embryo for making him dictator: he, charging on them the mysterious death of Hoche, pretended to be alarmed for his own safety. They snubbed him in trifles—refusing, for instance, to let him have Chambord as a gift from the nation; at the same time they encouraged him to undertake "some distant expedition which might put the finishing touch to his glory." They hoped to make him attack England, and fail; he chose the easier task of invading Egypt.

An easier task, but still as wild an expedition as ever emanated from a brain which ambition had already thrown off its balance. It succeeded, as far as Bonaparte himself was concerned; but if it had failed what would have been thought of carrying out of Europe, with peace yet unsigned, the pick of

the army and of the generals? The idea was as impolitic as that which brought on the Russian expedition. The difference was that now Bonaparte only had the control of comparatively a mere handful of men instead of the whole strength of the nation which he led to perish in Russian snows. Why Bonaparte chose Egypt was partly in order that France might see that she could not do without him; since Hoche's death he was unquestionably the foremost military man, and he so far foresaw the future as to have said, "that I may be master of France, the Directory must suffer some reverse in my absence." Money, the one thing wanting for the expedition, was got in the most cynical way by occupying Rome and invading Switzerland. Both steps were outrageous, considering that the plenipotentiaries at Rastadt were settling the terms of a peace long since practically concluded; but Rome was rich, and Berne richer still. Berthier plundered the former as it had seldom been plundered before; Brune seized at Berne sixteen million francs in specie and ingots, seven millions' worth of arms and ammunition, and eighteen millions' worth of stores: the long savings of the Swiss were wasted in a day. After all, it appeared as if Bonaparte was not anxious to go. Some troubles in Vienna gave him an excuse for lingering till the Directory, informed that he had contrived a plot to overthrow them, insisted on his going at once. He began to storm and to talk of throwing up his command. Rewbell handed him a pen, and said, "Well, resign at once; the Republic has plenty of sons who will not desert her." He took the pen, but let Merlin snatch it out of his hand. Next day he set out on a journey which exposed him to risk of capture in a way that, perhaps, he did not duly estimate.

On the eve of embarking, Bonaparte reviewed his army, and made a speech, for which another of a very different kind was afterwards substituted. The authenticity of the suppressed speech is proved (says M. Lanfrey) by a conversation reported by Las Casas. Of course, it is insincere; the expedition was originally planned against England, and its destination was still a secret; and, in its coarse appeal to the lowest motives, it surpasses even the address with which he inspired his men the first time he led them across into Italy. He appeals to their experiences in that rich pleasant country: "I found you starving on the Genoese seaboard; I took you into a land of plenty. But you've not yet done enough for your country, and your country has not yet done enough for you. I'm going to lead you where your exploits will surpass those

which have already astonished the world; and I promise every man that, on his return, he shall have the purchase-money of six acres of land." This speech so displeased the French public that, two days after it had appeared in the papers, it was pronounced apocryphal, and an expurgated edition was officially printed, from which all reference to baser motives was carefully excluded. The tricks of journalism, which, whether on the Stock Exchange or in the world of politics, are so shamefully resorted to now-a-days, were, we know, a part of Bonaparte's regular mode of action; but it seems that the Directory had been by no means behind hand in its use of them.

Seizing Malta, which the Knights, unworthy of their old fame, surrendered without a struggle, he confiscated all the stores that he found there, on the absurd pretext that the place had been made a refuge for French *émigrés*. Malta had no pictures worth stealing; but a silver model of the first galley which the Knights ever possessed was sent as a trophy to the Directory.

We need not follow Bonaparte through the Egyptian campaign. Everyone knows the strange manifestoes in which he sought to rouse the Egyptians to enthusiasm by telling them that he was come to rescue them from the Mamelukes, and to "restore the down-trodden people to their rights," and at the same time assuring them that he was their coreligionist. "We are (said he) the true Mussulmans. Have not we overthrown the Pope, who used to preach crusades? Have not we destroyed the Knights of Malta, because those madmen thought that God willed them to make war on Islam?" A strange jumble this of the "rights of man," which the Egyptians were wholly incapable of understanding, and of the stage Orientalism which characterises Voltaire's Mahomet. Bonaparte's "acting" was nowhere so exaggerated as in Egypt, and nowhere did it succeed less; he made himself the laughing-stock of his men without winning a single convert among the natives.

M. Lanfrey unhesitatingly charges on Bonaparte the loss of the fleet at Aboukir. His instructions to Brueys were: "If there is water enough, come into the port of Alexandria; if not, lie in the Aboukir roads, supposing you think you can defend yourself there; if you hear of a stronger force coming against you, sail across and take refuge in Corfu." This, says our author, was a choice of impossibilities: the port of Alexandria was too shallow for large vessels; the Aboukir roads gave him no shelter against Nelson's superior force; it



was impossible for him to go over to Corfu, because the general neglected, in spite of his repeated messages, to send him any provisions. The admiral was sacrificed, as MacMahon and Bazaine have just now been, to Bonaparte's vacillation. This prevented Brueys from sending out a couple of cruisers to signal the approach of the enemy. "I've sent you off fifty corn ships (writes Bonaparte on the eve of the battle of Aboukir), and thirty more will start to-morrow." Meanwhile, the fleet was destroyed; the army got into a state of rage and despair; and their leader calmed them by showing how easily, at the worst, Egypt, "a sort of island among deserts," might be held against all comers, and by rhodomontades about the fleet having necessarily "followed its fate when it had done its work. This is not the fickleness of Fortune—Fortune has served us well. I only asked her for five days, and in those five days I had become master of Egypt." After repressing the insurrection in Cairo, the reply to his coquetting with Islamism, his quotations from the Koran, and his pompous harangues to the sheiks, he marched into Syria, where, after the capture of Jaffa, he massacred 2,500 prisoners.\* About these prisoners there is a good deal of contradiction. Bonaparte tried, in his later *Memoirs*, to identify them with some who had before surrendered at El Arisch, and who (he says) escaped to Jaffa. At the time he wrote to the Directory:—"The taking of Jaffa was a very brilliant affair; we killed 4,000 of Djezzar's best troops, including the best gunners from Constantinople. I dealt severely with the garrison, who were taken with arms in their hands." His own private reflection, on this horrible cruelty, is, "War never seemed to me so hideous as it did at Jaffa." How he failed at Acre is well known; his rage is strongly manifested in his outcry against "that little sand-heap, that wretched group of hovels, which cheated him of his fate. Its fall would have changed the face of the world, for he would then have been Emperor of the East." There is little doubt that among the wild projects seething in his brain was included a march to Constantinople, where he hoped to carry his point by cajolery, and then a movement westward in which he expected to carry along with him Bashi-bazouks, Albanians, and all the fighting men of the East. The European enemies of France would thus be taken between two fires, and the project of Hannibal and Mithridates would at last be carried out.

---

\* Several chiefs of division, Colonel Boyer among others, refused to undertake this cold-blooded murder.

It was a poor exchange for such grand anticipations to bring back to Egypt, after abandoning his sick at Jaffa, an army weakened by losses and demoralised by the plague. Did he poison the sick whom he left behind? No, says M. Lanfrey, for Sir Robert Wilson afterwards retracted his assertion to that effect; and Desgenettes, when the plan was proposed to him, said bluntly, "My trade is to cure men, not to kill them." No thanks, however, to Bonaparte, for he had undoubtedly made the proposal; and he never seems to have been struck with its atrocity. At St. Helena he told O'Meara, what he dictated to Bertrand, that had his son been in the same case, he would have treated him in the same way.

The incurable dissimulation which marred all his conduct stamped the farewell to the troops whom he soon so strangely abandoned in Egypt. "I shall be back (said he) in two or three months," at the same time that he told Menou, the only man to whom he entrusted his secret, "If I am fortunate enough to get back to France, the reign of *bavardage* will be over."

Kleber was naturally incensed at the adroit manœuvre which shifted on him the sole responsibility of an expedition in planning which he had had no share. He wrote to the Directory a full statement of the truth; but his letter, intercepted by the English, did not reach France till the First Consul was in the height of his power, and Kleber himself had meanwhile died by the dagger of a fanatic Mussulman. Bonaparte published Kleber's letter with a running commentary of refutations; but, according to M. Lanfrey, who carefully analyses it, his answer is self-condemnatory.

Now comes the turning-point in Bonaparte's career, the famous 18th Brumaire. Throughout the events which led to the overthrow of the Directory, he acted with consummate treachery. "I will never (said he) draw my sword but in defence of the Republic and her Government." A month later his grenadiers were pressing with fixed bayonets into the council-room of the Five Hundred. The story has often been told; but those who wish to study Bonaparte at his worst should read it in the pages of M. Barni. The Directory was not an estimable body; it deserved its fate: but its sins need not have brought the ruin of constitutional government. Bonaparte might have been a Washington, the restorer of liberty, the remodeller of the constitution; he chose rather to be a very bad cross between Cæsar and Cromwell. Gohier's *Memoirs* give abundant proofs that Bonaparte's intentions were foreseen; they succeeded mainly because Sieyès joined

him, flattering himself that he should be the head while Bonaparte would be the arm of the new movement. By-and-by, when Sieyès found that his colleague in the Consulate was a man far above his own standard, he consented to give up his position, merely keeping as a *solatium* 600,000 francs and a magnificent estate, and handing poor Ducos only 200,000 francs as a retiring fee. One thing hard to understand is how Bonaparte managed to make Moreau, the old chief of the armies of the Rhine and Moselle, join in his plans so far as to blockade the Directory, or rather the two members, Moulins and Gohier, who alone remained true to their duty, in the Luxembourg palace. The pretext was that they were not safe without a military guard; but it was poor work for a man like Moreau to be playing traitor to the Government that he was sworn to support. Bonaparte may have worked on his mind by his way of playing with the word Republic. While those whom he addressed understood thereby a free government, he meant only the *res publica*, the State. Hence, on the earlier coinage of the Empire, we find "Napoleon, Emperor," on one side, and "French Republic" on the other—an insincerity worthy of Augustus. Further, the "red boggy," which has been so serviceable to the nephew, was on this occasion trotted out. "The Jacobins (said Sieyès and Bonaparte) are plotting to set the Terror up again." The fear of this, groundless as it was, no doubt weighed with a host of conscientious men, and made them accept military despotism as a refuge from anarchy.

How Lucien Bonaparte, President of the Five Hundred, harangued, shouting, when his brother was accused of aiming at the dictatorship, "If I thought so—if any one of you really thought so,—we should at once prepare the dagger of Brutus for the enemy of his country," is well known. Lucien gave his brother the support which Cromwell, a man of far more moral courage than Bonaparte, did not need when he "purged" the House.

The Consulate was marked from the first by a gradual suppression of liberty; everything which the Revolution had won at such a reckless sacrifice of life and happiness was wrested away by that Constitution of the year VIII., which is still the basis of the French system. Prefects (*empecreurs au petit pied* as Napoleon at St. Helena styled them) were set up in the fulness of that power which has ever since been the most efficient help to despotism. The law courts were arranged so as to resemble military tribunals. A whole hierarchy of officials was established, the good things to be divided among

whom soon stopped the mouths of many ardent republicans. Fuché, at the head of the police, was warrant enough that the spy system would be carried out to the fullest. The post-office was a joke; every letter was opened; and, worst of all, police agents were employed to hatch plots, and to egg on conspirators. In the last volume of the *Histoire d'un Paysan*, there is a graphic account of the seizing of Chauvel, the old Huguenot colporteur, who had been a deputy, and had kept his stern Republicanism unchanged through every vicissitude. Schinderhannes and his men come upon him at Phalsburg, and tear him, in the dead of the night, from the midst of his family; *nothing is ever heard of him again*. And this is only one instance of what went on for years all over France until "the heaven of Jacobinism was purged out." Of the murder of the Duke d'Enghien we need only quote Bonaparte's own remark: "Henceforth people will think twice before they plot against me, now that they know what I am capable of."

This mixture of force and fraud, of brutality and insincerity, led the way to the Empire; preparatory to which was also the Concordat, an arrangement for giving the despot a set of docile teachers of the duty of passive obedience. As for all the talk, repeated by M. Thiers and others, about this Concordat being "the setting up again of the altar of St. Louis and Charlemagne and Clovis," it is mere nonsense. Religion was perfectly free already; Roman Catholicism numbered about seven and a half million adherents: what Bonaparte wanted was a State religion over which he should have absolute control. His own religious views may be judged of from his idea of making Talleyrand a cardinal, and setting him at the head of his Church, and from a remark of his to Cabanis, "Do you know what this Concordat of mine is? Why, it is to religion what vaccination is to the small-pox; in fifty years there will be no more religious feeling in France." Verily, he might well say, in conversing with his generals, "Have not we got everything back comfortably into the old groove?" "Yes," replied one of them, "except the two millions of Frenchmen who have died for liberty's sake." The general was somewhat late in making this discovery.

On every point, then, the Constitution broke down under the pressure of military government; even the *code civil*—the great glory of his name—the new school of writers tell us, was not really Bonaparte's work at all: it had been well begun by the successive Assemblies, notably by the *Constituant*, in 1791, and again in 1793. Bonaparte (says M. Barni) cut out from it a great deal that was valuable, and put in much of the

old unfairness which the Revolution was supposed to have abolished for ever.

"Now, Bourrienne, we're at the Tuileries, we must take care to keep there," were the words by which the First Consul showed his satisfaction when his term of office was extended to two years. The Empire followed. As for republics, had not Bonaparte's work in Italy been to get rid of them? The preliminary coquetting before accepting the title reminds us a good deal of Cromwell's conduct when the crown was offered to him. With the hypocrisy which marks the whole life of the man, his accession to imperial power is called "the final triumph of public liberty and equality." Paul Louis Courier's account of how the choice between an emperor and the Republic was given to the army, "just as if you had been asked, which will you have, roast or boiled, potage or soup," is well known; so are the arts by which this first French *plébiscite*, if so it may be called, was carried. At Metz, for instance, forty pupils of the college of engineers refused to sign the address; five, picked out as ringleaders, were at once sent to prison; and the other thirty-five begged to be allowed to sign in order to obtain the liberation of their comrades. The clergy were, naturally, the most fulsome in their adulation. The Bishop of Aix said, "Napoleon, like another Moses, has been called out of the deserts of Egypt." He of Turin wrote, "Your Imperial Majesty has taught France her two wants—God and a monarch. As the God of the Christians is the sole being worthy of obedience and worship, so you, Napoleon, are the only man worthy to command the French." Napoleon is Jehoshaphat; he is Cyrus; he, "like a new Mattathias, appeared, sent by the Lord, amid the Assembly of the 18th Brumaire." Much in the same style is the Catechism in use in all French churches in 1811. After several questions about duty to princes, and to Napoleon in particular, it asks, "Are there not other special reasons for devoting ourselves to our Emperor, Napoleon I.?" "Yes; for it is he whom God raised up in the midst of troubles to restore public worship,—yea, the holy religion of our fathers,—and to be its protector. He brought back, and has preserved, public order by his deep and active wisdom; he defends the State by his powerful arm; he is become the anointed of the Lord by the consecration which he received from the sovereign Pontiff, the chief of the universal Church." Church and State were thus pretty much of a piece; and, though we may admire the high spirit with which the Pope met the pitiable indignities which Napoleon heaped on him,

we cannot sufficiently condemn the subserviency with which Concordat-clergy truckled to their new master. Of the strange scene before the coronation, the quarrel between Josephine and one of the Bonaparte sisters, even M. Thiers gives us a glimpse; he tells us, also, that Josephine and her husband were clerically married by Cardinal Fesch, in presence of Talleyrand and Berthier, on the night before the coronation; but he does not say that the Pope, to whom Josephine had appealed, had insisted on this before consenting to carry out the already published programme of the ceremony.

With his rise to supreme power the cruelty of Bonaparte's character seems to have more fully developed. The cases of Palm, and of poor Marquis Rodio, executed after the court-martial had acquitted him, show that recklessness of others' pain which was manifested in another form in the retreat from Russia and in the *saute qui peut* at Waterloo.

A more wholesale instance of his disregard for others was the continental blockade, that sort of crusade against England. Nothing made him so unpopular as the wholesale burning of English goods in all the towns under his control from Hamburg to Naples. It seemed a constant *auto da fé* in honour of despotism. "I have seen," says an eye-witness, "poor women at Genoa fall on their knees beside the burning heap and beg to be allowed to pull out a bit of cloth or linen to clothe their half-naked children." Blind as selfish men usually are, the Emperor forgot that to raise the price of everybody's sugar and coffee was a more dangerous experiment than even to gratuitously insult the vassal kings of Germany.

This blindness soon spread to his military genius. M. Lanfrey criticises very severely the campaigns of Pultusk and Eylau (November, 1806, to February, 1807), noting, of course, as he goes along, the cruel treatment of Poland, which did so much for Bonaparte and which he so often deceived. In 1801, he had written to "citizen" Talleyrand: "The First Consul does not wish that there should be any question of Poland in political discussions: such question would be wholly useless." In 1807, after Eylau, he tells Bertrand "to suppress everything which tends to point to the Emperor as a liberator; and to let M. de Zartrow, the Russian envoy, get an inkling that, as to Poland, since the Emperor has known the country he does not attach any importance to it." Friedland, of course, was a brilliant victory, won, however, say the modern critics, more by the furious valour of Ney than by the clever arrangements of his master. It led to Tilsit; at which meeting the Czar said, "I hate the English as much as you do



yourself." "If that is the case," was the reply, "the peace is made already;" and this peace enabled Napoleon to organise a severe oppression of neutral states. Then came more despotic acts at home—the suppression of the Tribunate, and the formation of an order of hereditary nobles "as a means of reconciling France with Europe." And then, in October, 1807, began the plot of the Escorial. All the details of this flagitious transaction, so discreditable to everyone concerned, are given dispassionately by M. Lanfrey: it formed a fitting prelude to the treachery of Bayonne.

The Peninsular war is sufficiently familiar to most English readers, though few of them realise the value of the thoroughly national rising which our troops supported. The very want of centralisation in Spain, which prevented it from making any grand collective effort, secured it from conquest. Prussia was powerless after Jena, Ulm opened the gates of Vienna; but when the Castilian army was routed, that of Andalusia began to be troublesome; when Asturias was overrun, Catalonia rose in revolt. As we said, Spain was the rock on which Napoleon's power was wrecked; its stubborn resistance gave other nations time to breathe and to reflect. The great conqueror was shown to be not invincible. Germany was encouraged to form her Tugendbund. Stein and Hardenberg, by emancipating the peasants, raised Prussia from a weak feudal state to a power which has steadily grown to her present vast dimensions. "Fatherland" became a reality, and the doom of the crowd of petty princes, who had so long paralysed the great Teutonic race, was sealed. England, too, which had hitherto contented herself chiefly with winning naval victories, and paying subsidies to half-a-dozen continental powers, out of admiration at the gallant attitude of Spain, joined vigorously in the war, and never stayed her hand till the hollowness of the huge colossus had been clearly proved to the world. M. Lanfrey's book does not aim, like Napier's, at giving a complete military account of the Peninsular campaigns. Politics, not battles, are his chief subject-matter. He is, however, specially useful to the English reader, as calling attention to those efforts of the Spaniards themselves which it is too much our fashion to decry. The men who forced on the capitulation of Baylen, where Dupont, with 20,000 men, surrendered to Castanos, certainly deserve better treatment than they have had at the hands of most English historians. "Europe after Baylen," is the title of M. Lanfrey's most eloquent chapter, in which he shows how the marching off of the Romagna contingent, quartered by the Baltic, was merely a sign of the

universal discontent which began to show itself from Sicily to Sweden.\*

In France it became harder and harder to enforce the conscription. Ten or twelve flying columns of light horse and foot were employed to hunt up the runaways: "It was (says M. Barni) the system of the *dragonnades* applied to military service." These *garnisaires*, as the troops were called, drove the people to despair. No wonder that when Napoleon was on his way to Elba, their hatred burst out, and the ex-Emperor was glad to disguise himself as an English colonel. With Europe in such a state as this, the Russian campaign was undertaken, the bulletin announcing the total failure of which ended with the strange phrase, "His Imperial Majesty's health never was better." This, of course, was a bit of that "Roman spirit" which he so constantly affected: he, too, would seem, like Varro after Cannæ, "not to have despaired of the republic." Madness only can excuse—and in this case there very probably was madness to excuse—the folly, not only of the Russian expedition, but of his refusal to make peace, when Metternich, in June, 1813, besought him to do so. "I'm certain your master is gone out of his mind," was the Austrian prince's remark to Berthier, after a stormy interview, in which Napoleon grossly insulted him, and the result of which was the complete adhesion of Austria to the alliance formed against France.

But we must close. Of Waterloo we will only say, that had he waited after the defeat of Ney to form a rear-guard of even a few hundred men, he would simply have been doing what might have been expected from the most ordinary general, but what, after every defeat, Napoleon showed himself wholly incapable of doing. Lucien, when the extent of the disaster at Waterloo was known, showed himself far the more courageous of the two. "Put France in a state of siege; dissolve the Chambers; name yourself Dictator, and fight it out to the last," was his advice. But it was not in Napoleon to act in such a way. His force of will was gone: that crushing overthrow had subdued the spoiled child of fortune.

Such is the brief outline of the picture on the darker features of which M. Lanfrey and his school delight to dwell. It is very different, assuredly, from the popular idea of Napoleon. Channing was the first to strike the key-note of the chorus which has now been taken up by many who have access to proofs whose existence he could not suspect; but, after

\* Strangely enough these Romagna troops, working their way to an English squadron, were carried over to Spain, and took part in the war of independence.

all, the most damaging evidence against the man is his own letters. But for the publication of the complete correspondence, books like M. Lanfrey's would want completeness. Our plan has been to pay most attention to least known facts ; and while we wish "nought to extenuate and nought set down in malice," we cannot but delight to feel that so much of the gilding is being torn off from the world's great military idol. The best hope of universal peace, which, alas, still seems so far distant, is to show up the hollowness and unreality, the miserable stage-acting and petty deceptions, of those who have dazzled men by warlike success. Had France considered what she lost by "Napoleon's consummate genius," she would have been less ready to lay herself at the feet of his nephew.

Of the Erckmann-Châtrian books we have spoken far too little. They give an admirably lively picture of the times, setting forth in the coldest, clearest light Bonaparte's selfishness, and the weakness of the men who let him climb to power, nay who, by their mutual jealousies, helped him in his ascent. France, too, as a nation, is surely answerable in no small degree for having exalted such a very questionable idol. Yet the mass of Frenchmen, dazzled by the renown which he won for their country, were in a very different position from the great minds who ought to have known better and to have made head against the popular madness.

To sum up, M. Lanfrey and his school have an ungrateful task. It is never well for sons to expose the failings of their mother, and this they cannot help doing, for France has fully identified herself with Napoleon's littleness as with his greatness. His littlenesses are on the surface. He never could understand the moral forces opposed to him ; he simply ignored them. He seemed, by the insults which he heaped on almost all with whom he had to do, to forget that men have feelings, and that, when the day of reckoning comes, they will give those feelings play. In his overweening selfishness, he so despised his fellow-creatures, as to look on them as pawns on the chess-board of his ambition, which was the world. His career shows how little moral progress mankind has made. Here, amid all the material appliances of modern civilisation, was a man who acted just as we believe Nimrod or any other early conqueror acted ; nay, whom Alexander left far behind in generosity and consideration for others. Of course, what we see going on around us now only strengthens this conviction that human progress is very slow—inappreciably slow compared with the dreams of the optimists : but the First Napoleon illus-

trated this truth on a grander scale than anyone now-a-days is likely to do.

Terror and "glory" were Napoleon's two springs of action. "We must give the French some playthings (*hochets*) to amuse them," was his expression when founding the Legion of Honour. "I never think a place is conquered till there has been a good revolt well crushed," was his answer to Joseph, who, always anxious to deal kindly with those under his rule, was trying to prevent an outbreak among the lower orders in Naples. "Let the Naples mob break out; it's just what we want." So in Italy, where, after his first campaign, his exactions had provoked insurrection, "make examples," was the one burden of his instructions to commandants. Hearing that the Bishop of Udine was disposed to be fractious, "Have him out, and shoot him," he wrote, "if you can possibly get a case against him. A little wholesome severity with those priests (*la prêtraille*) would save us a world of trouble." So, when Pavia was restless, his directions were, "Find some patrician family that is compromised, and cut it off root and branch—sons, cousins, and all. I understand these Italians." The same rule he applied in Spain; but though his "examples" there were severe enough, we have seen that they produced just the opposite effect from what he had intended. He thought he had subjugated the nation when he had crushed its armies; he took no account of patriotism, of old associations, of the pride of a race never subdued since Moorish times.

It has been often noticed that this blindness to the moral side of humanity was accompanied with a yet grosser blindness as to the true aims and the real power of literature. He merely looked on it as an ornamental accessory of his power. His plan, which so dazzled the French, of managing the details of the theatre in the midst of the business of a campaign, was just the carrying out of his principle that art, letters, philosophy, were only instruments for ruling men, and that public opinion on all subjects was best guided by the intervention of the prefect of police. For *savants* he had a contempt which he seldom cared to hide: to those who could be bought he paid a miserably poor price for their efforts in his cause; those whom, like Madame de Staël, he was unable to buy over, he sought to silence by persecution and exile.

The mischief he did to France is not to be measured by the loss of territory to which his mad ambition subjected her; it is incalculable, because, by thoroughly organising her for despotism, by crushing out the remnants of liberty which had

survived the Terror, he left her an easy prey to any succeeding despot.

In the sincerity of Napoleon's early Republicanism we have no faith. At the time of the Corsican revolt he wrote, in the rhodomontade style which was always so easy to him, a great deal about the independence of his island; but we believe that when he finally left Corsica, his contempt for men was as formed, and his unscrupulousness in appealing to their worst passions as complete, as after he had grown surfeited with flattery and disgusted with ingratitude.

M. Lanfrey depicts him as mean, vain-glorious, selfish, acting with a mixture of cunning and violence; and certainly the facts of which he reminds us, and to which he gives a prominence that they have not in M. Thiers' "unconscientious" narrative, go far to prove that he was all that M. Lanfrey paints him. Yet he made himself one with France; and so we are driven back on the supposition that his natural temper was strengthened by the insight which he gained, when he was "a youthful Terrorist hanging on to the Robespierres," into the despicable—the incredibly despicable—littleness of most of the wretched wire-pullers who managed (and marred) the Revolution. Here is the difficulty of the Irreconcilables—the Revolution failed, and Bonaparte succeeded; were both failure and success due to something in the French character, or merely to the force of circumstances? For a Frenchman the dilemma is an unpleasant one: M. Lanfrey, at any rate, has extricated himself from it judiciously.

---

ART. VI.—1. *An Act for the Better Prevention of Contagious Diseases at certain Naval and Military Stations* (11th June, 1866).

2. *An Act to Amend the Contagious Diseases Act* (11th August, 1869).

3. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Contagious Diseases Act* (Session 1867-8).

4. *Report from the Select Committee on Contagious Diseases Act* (1866). *Communicated from the Commons to the Lords*, 1869.

WE do not care to conceal the reluctance with which we purpose to review the discussion raised by the Acts of Parliament, the titles of which are prefixed to this article. The general subject to which they relate is full of "lamentation, and mourning, and woe;" and its details are revolting, and even horrible. It is difficult to deal with it in a calm and patient spirit. What seems, however, to have become a duty must be encountered.

It is vain to regret that the discussion has arisen. The Acts against which so much public indignation is now directed passed very quickly and quietly. Such legislation, if to be justified at all, ought to be prompt and secret; but the moment its principle, and its proposed modes of action, are understood by a free people, bitter controversy is inevitable. A spurious expediency, and certain scientific theories, are on the one side; natural instincts and plain right on the other. We deplore that occasion has been given for the controversy. It is bad enough that we, of the less worthy sex, should be called upon to exercise ourselves upon such matters. But that accomplished and high-minded women have been goaded into excitement, and almost into exasperation, and have thought themselves compelled to discuss such a topic orally, and before mixed audiences, of old and young, is a calamity beyond estimate. To save a city otherwise doomed to ruin, the old legend tells us, purity once rode unveiled through deserted streets. Modern civilisation shows us other scenes.

One preliminary observation more. We suggest to the General Committee of the Ladies' Association for the repeal of the obnoxious Acts a little more care as to the publications to which they give the sanction of their names. Dr. Chap-



man\* has rendered valuable service by his exhaustive treatment of that part of the question to which he has addressed himself. But the tone and temper in which he commends his case to the readers of the *Westminster Review* are not such as will enlist the sympathies of the Christian men and women of England. The animus is very plain with which he ventures to assert that, until 1864, the evil complained of has been left by "Christian purism to welter in foul diseases; no helping hand being extended to the worst of sufferers from it by even those whom Christian charity is ordinarily wont to stimulate to deeds of mercy, but who, when perforce encountering it, merely look on its attendant misery, and hastily pass by on the other side." The Lock Hospital, we believe, is older than the century; and the first of the many penitentiaries which seek to reclaim fallen women is almost as old. Dr. Chapman ought to have informed himself that these were founded by men of the distinctively Evangelical school, and have received their principal support from them. But this is not all. Very impertinently, he hazards propositions which he knows that nobody, in the course of such a discussion, will spend time in controverting; but which, he ought to know also, have been finally disposed of elsewhere. That the Christianity taught by the Great Teacher differs widely from that taught by its chief Apostle; but that both lay down laws which discourage marriage; and that the Roman Catholic Church has consistently carried out these laws, by requiring celibacy on the part of the clergy, and by sanctioning it in the case of monks and nuns; are statements which the Ladies' Association cannot serve its cause by circulating.

Now to our subject. We hope and believe that to many of our readers some very elementary explanation must be given, and we cannot shrink from giving it. It is well that, during the simplicity of childhood, and from the plainest and most natural, yet most sacred, of books, they learned, long before they understood, the nature of the sin to which reference must be frequently made. They do not know, perhaps, that, more directly than in the case of any other sin, painful and loathsome physical consequences ensue. Disease—in the case of frequent offenders—obstinate, if not incurable, taints the entire system. It is contagious. Chaste wives, loving mothers, unborn babes, innocent children to the third and fourth generations, share the punishment,—it may be, of even

\* Prostitution: Governmental Experiments in Controlling It. By John Chapman, M.D., &c. Trübner & Co. Reprinted from the *Westminster Review*, January, 1870.

one transgressor. The purest of women are contaminated by vicious men. Female transgressors, on the other hand, pollute and poison men, whose offence is occasional, or even single. The sin and the curse are very common, especially in places where large bodies of men, most of them, as in the cases of the army and navy, unmarried, are separated from ordinary society. No one can exaggerate the horrors which haunt camps and seaports. Thousands of both sexes, mutually seduced, live in the lowest vice, and are disabled, for longer or shorter periods of time, from all capacity of useful service; and death itself is the frequent, and almost merciful, end of multitudes.

The very sin which God marks with this special doom is that which many men, nominally Christian and personally moral, are most disposed to wink at, extenuate, and, to some extent, practically to justify. The crime is measured, not by its intrinsic character, nor by its peculiarly disastrous results, but by the greater or less force of the temptation to commit it. It cannot be prevented, is the argument; but religion and humanity require you to step in and mitigate its physical evils. Let it be cheerfully conceded, in spite of much clamour to the contrary, that some very good men honestly adopt the same views. They concede too readily the impossibility of checking the cause. As to remedying the consequences, so far as human mercy can avail, all are agreed.

We have alluded to the year 1864. It was during that year that the first Act, in reference to what were somewhat vaguely called "Contagious Diseases," was passed. In 1866 that Act was virtually repealed, and a new Act passed, which, as amended by an Act of 1869, embodies the law now in force.

These Acts were passed with the intention of protecting soldiers and sailors "at certain naval and military stations." No one will deny that these classes of men have peculiar claims upon the public care; nor that the State, in its own interest, is bound to make the most economical use of the labour for which it pays. We have no kind of sympathy with those who attribute to the promoters of this legislation any improper motive, or the want of a full consideration of the difficulties of the case. Neither of the great political parties is more than the other responsible for it. If, as we think, a great mistake has been made, all the more ready are we to acknowledge that it has originated in an earnest, honest, and rapidly-increasing desire to better the condition of the Queen's forces; a desire which has resulted in many most important improvements of their moral and physical condition.

What, then, are the provisions of these Acts? We have seen that their operation is, for the present, confined to certain specified military and naval stations in England and Ireland, including the towns and parishes in their immediate neighbourhood.

For each of these places a medical officer is appointed to act as visiting surgeon. Another medical officer is appointed as inspector of certain hospitals, provided and certified under the Acts, which are to be under the management of persons chosen by the Admiralty or the War Office; adequate provision being required to be made for the moral and religious instruction of the women detained therein.

Whenever an information on oath is laid before a justice by a superintendent of police, charging that the informant has good reason to believe that the woman therein named is a common prostitute, and either is resident within the prescribed district, or within ten miles therefrom, or, having no settled place of abode, has within fourteen days previously been within the district for the purpose of prostitution, or outside these limits for the purposes of prostitution with men resident within them, a justice may, if he thinks fit, issue a notice thereof, addressed to such woman, which is to be duly served upon her.

If she appear in answer to the notice, or if she do not so appear, then, upon proof of the service of the notice, the justice may order that the woman shall be subject to a periodical medical examination by the visiting surgeon, for any period not exceeding a year, for the purpose of ascertaining whether she is affected with contagious disease; and thereupon she is subject to such examination accordingly.

Any woman may voluntarily, by a submission in writing, signed in the presence of the superintendent of police, subject herself to a periodical medical examination for any period not exceeding one year.

If the woman examined is found to be affected with a contagious disease, she may be detained in a certified hospital until discharged by the chief medical officer; but she is not to be detained for a longer time than six months, unless upon certificate that her further detention for medical treatment is requisite; nine months, however, is the limit.

If she consider herself unduly detained, she has an appeal to the justice.

If any woman subjected, by order of a justice, to periodical examination, refuses or neglects to submit herself to it, or quits the hospital without being duly discharged, or does not conform to its regulations, she is liable, on summary conviction, to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, in the case of a first offence, for any term not exceeding one month, and of a subsequent offence, for any term not exceeding three months.

If on any woman leaving a certified hospital, notice is given to her that she is still diseased, and she is afterwards in any place, for

the purpose of prostitution, without having previously received from a visiting surgeon a certificate that she is free from disease, she is liable to the penalties before named.

The order subjecting any woman to periodical medical examination is enforceable so long as she is resident within the district, or within ten miles thereof, but not for a longer period than one year; but if the chief medical officer, on her discharge from hospital, certify that she is cured, the order ceases to operate.

Any woman desiring to be relieved from periodical medical examination, and not being in hospital, may be relieved from examination by order of a justice; but he has power to require sureties for her good behaviour for three months.

Any owner or occupier within the district, having reasonable cause to believe any woman to be a common prostitute, and to be diseased, and inducing or suffering her to resort to his or her house, for the purpose of prostitution, is liable to fine or imprisonment, and remains liable to all other consequences of keeping a disorderly house.

By the Act of 1869, any woman subjected, either on her own submission, or under the order of a justice, to a periodical medical examination, who desires to be relieved therefrom, may be relieved by the visiting surgeon, if the superintendent of police report that she has ceased to be a common prostitute.

We have given this complete summary of the Acts, because we think that the very statement of their provisions suggests at once to an unprejudiced mind a series of unanswerable objections to them.

The first thing that strikes us is, that whilst, on the one hand, this legislation is restricted to the weaker and more unprotected sex, its operation, in relation to them, is of the widest character. Any woman resident within the prescribed, the proscribed, district, or within a radius of ten miles! Any woman, not having any settled place of abode, visiting the district for supposed improper purposes! And this, in the case of large towns, where garrisons are placed; but where, to speak far below the truth, the majority of women are as virtuous as their sisters elsewhere; and worse still, in quiet country places, ten miles from military and naval stations,—a much greater distance than many an innocent country girl, many an honest matron, has ever travelled in her life. Prostitutes haunt Aldershot, a camp placed by the Government in what was one of the most secluded regions of the land; and, therefore, all the women, within ten miles of it, or visiting it from necessity or for pleasure, are to be placed at the mercy of officers of police! If, indeed, you make laws like these, they *must* be sweeping in their range, and searching and in-

quisitorial in their action; but this is our first, and, we think, a conclusive, argument against making them at all.

But then comes a more startling consideration. It is demand that creates supply. And whence comes the demand in this case? We know too well that woman is sometimes the seducer; very exceptionally, the seducer of many. Some modern novelists, indeed, would almost make it out that she lives for no other purpose than to break the whole round of the commandments. Vicious men, too, who never lived under the balmy shade of a woman's love, may well imagine her to be altogether such as they are. But, to speak plainly, in order to put down wrong, is this style of thought consistent with our most intimate knowledge of her, of the common observation and experience of mankind in all climes, lands, and ages? Is not the other sex, notoriously, by a natural instinct,—an instinct which society, in all its stages of advancement illustrates,—the seeker, suitor, solicitor,—often the insane worshipper? Yet the laws we are now reprobating ignore all this. The man—the beast—man, the almost universal cause of the evil which defiles and destroys him and his victim, body and soul together, is to be protected, if it may be, at the expense of womankind in general, while society has no protection against him. Begin with him, is the obvious demand of a wise and impartial justice. Put him at the mercy of a sworn information of the belief of an officer of police; summon him before a magistrate; expose his loathsomeness; subject him to repeated inspection; lock him up in a hospital until it be safe to let him loose again. If he rebel, imprison him,—we should say, *with* the hard labour which may help to tame his passions. Try this system, as to officer and private alike, at your great military and naval stations, to begin with, and then extend it, as you must, if your principle be a good one, to the county at large. Place decorous policemen,—themselves, of course, always pure and healthy,—at the doors of your London club-houses; multiply them at your village wakes; let them suspect and report at their pleasure, and apply, in all cases, such provisions as are contained in these Acts. You dare not; and yet this system of indignity is to be acted out against women!

Nor must we forget the arbitrariness of the powers given by these Acts; nor the class of persons to whom these powers are entrusted. A superintendent of police, having, as he thinks, or swears he thinks, good reason to believe that a woman is habitually vicious, puts the law in motion against her. We admit that, so far as a short experience affords us

any evidence of the working of the Acts, the discretion thus given has not, in any large number of cases, been abused. But that is not just now the question. The State plants large bodies of unmarried men, under all conceivable temptations to idleness and immorality, in certain districts of the country convenient for its purpose. It sows the evil it seeks to remedy; and then, because of the evil, it puts its ban on the district. The protection to which all the Queen's subjects are entitled is withdrawn. A thief or a murderer, resident in the district, cannot be detained for twenty-four hours unless some evidence be adduced before a magistrate in support of the charge against him. The most virtuous woman, residing within the same limits, may be subjected to outrage,—and, in her case, it is nothing else,—upon the bare statement that she is suspected. It is no answer to say that no law can be so framed as to avoid occasional injury to the innocent. Laws must be so framed as to avoid, as much as possible, all injustice; and here is a law which punishes on suspicion. For the punishment often lies in the very suspicion. No result of an investigation before a magistrate, however favourable to the suspected, can remedy the damage done to feeling and to reputation by charging her with a single act, not to say with an habitual course, of unchastity. And how does the law work? The theory of an investigation before a magistrate looks well on paper; but it is nothing more than a theory. The woman summoned, vicious or chaste, will not undergo the publicity of a magisterial investigation, and voluntarily submits to the periodical medical examination. If she be infamous, she avoids the exposure which might spoil her trade; if she be unjustly charged, she all the more anxiously hides the shame of the suspicion. The evidence on this subject, given before both Houses, is conclusive. Very few orders have been made by the justices. We repeat that to be accused involves, practically, all the penalties of guilt. Under the Act of 1869, indeed, the medical officer may direct that a woman, ascertained upon examination to be healthy, shall be discharged from further attendance, upon a police report that she has ceased to be vicious. But what of the woman who never was unchaste?

Suspicion thus involving certain punishment, how is the suspicion formed? The vigilant policeman has several sources of information. He goes to the hospital where diseased men are detained, and ascertains their ignorant and hap-hazard speculations as to the sources of contamination; the informant, not improbably, having himself tainted the suspected.



He talks confidentially with the keepers of disorderly houses, and, in the interests of purity, forsooth, allies himself with people whom no moral man can find language strong enough to denounce, people more than scouted by the law itself, their trade illegal, their places of business treated as though they were the dens of unclean beasts. He receives anonymous letters. He *must* have recourse to means like these, for the disease does not necessarily brand the sinner with any mark plain to ordinary eyes. And it is upon evidence furnished in this manner that English women throughout large districts of the country—most of them in the lower walks of life, but as pure as the most illustrious, less familiar, indeed, with the scenes and amusements which tend to debauch the upper ranks of society—are to be suspected, and, we repeat, because suspected exposed to outrage. In the nature of things, the testimony thus collected must be untrustworthy. It is admitted that it is sometimes found to be absolutely false; that sometimes it is given from spiteful and malicious motives.

We have spoken of outrage; and we are driven into the most delicate part of the discussion. The indignity connected with one periodical medical examination for the purpose in view, to one modest woman, cannot be decently explained; yet this law creates it in the possible cases of many. It is worse than the enforced exposure of the person to men not, we may be allowed to think, the most favoured of the honourable profession to which they belong, nor the least prone to its temptations. It involves the use of instruments, horrible in anticipation, disgusting in operation, and, as we gather from one hint in the Parliamentary evidence, not always free from the danger of creating the mischief they are constructed to discover. And all this on the sacred body of a woman, the natural idea, the artistic type, the scriptural symbol, of all that is beautiful and good! Of a woman, chaste as our mother Eve—pure as the blessed Virgin!

Up to this point we have established a case for the repeal of these Acts on the ground of the breadth of the scope of their operation, of their unfair restriction to the better sex, and of the arbitrary powers which they confer. Specially we have denounced them because of the danger that provisions intended for the unfortunate and abandoned may be put in force against the best and purest of our countrywomen. But we have not by any means exhausted our objections.

The avowed object of the law is to stamp out the disease, while the sin is recognised and pampered. Soldiers and sailors,

it is argued, *will* indulge in vice. A large proportion of them suffer its consequences, and the working strength of the army and navy is reduced accordingly. Pity the sufferers and economise the public expenditure.

We are no advocates of what are falsely called woman's rights. We have no kind of sympathy with the motives, objects, spirit, or plans of the extending agitation on that subject. But surely, if such of the weaker sex as make or influence our legislation had intended to create an occasion for remonstrance or demand, nothing could have been more opportune and effective than these recent Acts.

Men, equally with women, sin and suffer, and spread the poison of disease; yet women only are to be the subjects of suspicion, examination, and punishment. Why not? We blush to give the answer. If the woman be healthy, of course there is much less danger to the man, and it is the man, and not the woman, in whose sole interest this legislation is devised. It is said that the woman also is directly benefited. Why not, then, give her, at least, the equal benefit of subjecting suspected men to the disgusting processes prescribed by the Acts,—processes less abhorrent to him in violating what little modesty he may retain, more consistent with that special discipline to which he has contracted that he will conform himself? He chose the army or the navy as his occupation. What choice had the farmer's young wife, living within the doomed district,—within ten miles of Windsor or Aldershot? But the truth is manifest. In the first place, the men would never submit to any such minute investigation as these Acts require. Some ten years ago, it was the custom to submit soldiers to a cursory periodical inspection. The practice has been almost universally abandoned. The army-surgeon did not like his task; and all the military authorities agreed that no practical benefit came from it. Such are the reasons assigned for the abandonment of the inspection of men; but we have no manner of doubt that there are others which prevent its general revival. Soldiers and sailors, not yet all that they should be, are still very improved classes of men. Marriage receives more encouragement; education is more effectively imparted; pleasant occupations for leisure hours are provided; religion is more widely spread. Men thus trained and cared for, many of them self-restrained and moral, would never submit to laws which proceed upon suspicion and destroy self-respect. Of course the worst of them would not be more tractable. And what if *all the men* within the prescribed district, military or civilian, were to be liable to examination?

This would be equal justice and equal expediency. But would anything but rebellion ensue upon any effort to enforce such a system?

We must look, too, at the operation of the Acts as among the various classes of depraved women. There are some, probably not many, so bad that no examination could shock their feelings. It is proved that some willingly submit to inspection for the purpose of obtaining a certificate of freedom from disease, and of using the certificate as a means of solicitation. These classes, however, do not constitute the whole of the persons on whom the law is intended to operate. Few women designedly set out upon a wicked course of life. Seduced, generally speaking, and then betrayed, her character gone, and, probably, without any means of honest livelihood, it is still by degrees that she makes up her mind to a career of sin. Some do not go so far as this; they sin and repent, yet fall again, without habitually yielding to evil. Alas, that poverty drives some to occasional vice! But this searching law applies to all these cases alike. All are treated as equally infamous and dangerous. We can think of but one other class of these miserable women. Officers have their kept mistresses, not always faithful to them, and, therefore, liable to contagion. Does the superintendent of police make it his business to haunt their resorts and pick up information about them? We suppose not. One main feature of the case is the difficulty of ascertaining who is, or is not, "a common prostitute."

Then comes the inquiry, whether legislation in this direction will effect its object. The evidence given before both Houses would seem, at first sight, to favour such a conclusion; but a very cursory examination leads to no such result. Malta and Sheerness appear to be the places principally relied upon. In both the disease is said to have considerably abated. But the one naturally, and the other in point of fact, is so secluded from communication with neighbouring populations, as to furnish no data whatever for guessing at the ultimate probabilities of the case. The case of India also is quoted on the other side. But the most recent information as to the short and partial working of the system there, by no means encourages its adoption elsewhere. To justify acts like these, we must be sure of our ground. A long and large experience must be gained; and, to take the lowest ground, we object to experiments which involve present results such as we have indicated, unless success be certain.

Sanitary laws, in general, such as are favoured by the

practice of modern States, and particularly by that of our own, furnish no kind of precedent. We agree to compel each other, under strict statutory penalties, to avoid those causes of disease which are the necessary results of the congregation in towns of large masses of people. We insist upon it that every child born in our midst shall be vaccinated. We do well. We have ascertained by an induction of facts, demonstrated to us by the common daily observation of mankind, that dirt breeds fever, and that vaccination, as a system, and on the whole, prevents small-pox. There is no such proof of even the partial efficacy of laws like those now under review. Indeed, all the evidence is on the other side. The topic is too wide to admit of full discussion here. Dr. Chapman has very patiently and ably examined the long succession of laws which, in most of the countries of Europe, have for ages been brought to bear upon the attempt to make vice safe and healthy. We can hardly attempt even a summary of the facts which we think he has demonstrated. State interference has, in some cases, had in view the stamping out the crime by rigorous penalties. Failing this, it has, in other cases, attempted to make it comparatively decorous, and to prevent its physical consequences. So far back as the time of Constantine the former system was tried. St. Louis, in France, pursued the same course, but had to confess it was in vain. It was three hundred years, however, before, in that country, failure was admitted, and then the opposite course of licensed prostitution gradually adopted, ripening ultimately into the present French system of organised crime with its ever-inevitable misery. Spain much earlier adopted the policy of arbitrary suppression, but seems to have subsequently alternated between both systems—both failing to prevent disease. Prussia reversed the order of processes,—began with licensing, and then changed to repression, and then partially reverted to the former, disease largely increasing, and finally settled down into its first practice, crime and its penalties continuing in full force.

But, in support of our views, we feel under no kind of necessity to resort to the argument to be drawn from these facts. Had the experience of centuries been just what it has not been, we must, not only in the interest of religion, but of humanity, of the benevolence which seeks the ultimate extirpation of all the physical results of evil, protest against the principle on which these Acts are founded. That principle appears to be, that it is legitimate and expedient to attempt the repression of vice by depriving it of its consequent phy-

sical evils. We deny the legitimacy of the effort. There are Divine ordinances of which it is the very substance that sin in general shall not go unpunished; that particular sins shall have their special and appropriate punishments. These ordinances are recognised in modern schemes to repress intemperance, and so far, at least, these schemes are good. Who ever thinks of effectually curing a drunkard by seeking to remedy the consequences of his vice? The vice itself must be subdued. And so of licentiousness. There are very good men, indeed, generally sympathising with us, whose views, logically pushed, would seem to imply that it is the province of Christian duty to let the evil take its own course, and to suffer the persistent sinner to endure all the physical penalties he has incurred. We have no sympathy with opinions so extreme as these. Pain and sorrow are not the less pitiable because they can be traced to a course of wrong. But the law is eternal, that evil insures a terrible retribution, and that, if you would prevent the retribution, you must abate the evil. And, as we must contend, a State whose general system of legislation recognises a Supreme Ruler of men, and certain obligations, and sanctions what He has established, is at utter inconsistency with itself when it ignores, for purposes of its own economy or convenience, certain clear and definite laws, of the meaning of which, could it be for an instant doubted, the sad experience of mankind is the infallible interpreter.

What weight do these considerations carry when we remember that the very object of the Acts is, by making vice safe, to render it practicable and easy! "Prostitution," says an eminent authority on the other side, "prostitution is a public necessity." It cannot be put down, is the assertion. God's law of virtue cannot be kept. Men must sin. Do not attempt to starve vice. It may be regretted that freedom from its consequences will, of necessity, stimulate its practice; but consider the unfortunate patient, and, above all, save the public purse! And all this in the very teeth of that plain, highest law, not one jot or tittle of which shall fail, and in derogation of one of its plainest and best, because purest teachings! And to "teach men so;" to tell them, not directly, but by a more suggestive and effective teaching,—the very spirit of the laws which regulate their daily life,—to teach men that they must sin, and, if human means can help it, they shall not suffer! We cannot believe that honest and enlightened Christian men will, in any considerable numbers, commit themselves to a course like this.

We have, most of us, some excuse as to the past in the fact of our ignorance of the very existence of these Acts, to say nothing of their principle, tendency, and actual working. But, surely, our responsibility as to the future cannot be too gravely estimated.

Had this aspect of the question been presented by Professor Amos\* in his calm, and otherwise complete, discussion of the question, his tractate would have thoroughly satisfied us; but, as its title shows, it is confined to the moral and political bearings of the legislation now under discussion. Our object in quoting him is to state even more shortly than he has done, and with the risk of repeating ourselves, the case which can be made out in favour of and against the Acts, as viewed from the position to which a purely secular philosophy restricts itself. It is conceded that their operation has been to reduce the number of notorious women, probably through fear of examination and penalty; to abate the virulence of disease in the instances in which the Act is enforced; and to create a growing external decency in the places to which they extend. On the other hand, such legislation, so far as experience can be consulted, leads invariably to clandestine prostitution, and so to neglected and concealed disease, and secret and abusive treatment of disease; these issuing in the most frightful consequences. And, again, while abandoned women desert, abandoned men resort to, the protected districts. Once more, the strain upon the honesty and discretion of the police is too great, more especially considering the character of the subjects of their control. And, lastly, the outward decorousness of protected districts is but superficial, and hides an increasing amount of quiet profligacy. Such is an impartial summary of the evidence; as yet, it must be remembered, necessarily gathered from narrow areas, and but for a short period. If the operation of the Acts be extended to the whole country, as their supporters contend they ought to be, some of these considerations, on both sides the argument, would become inapplicable; but such as mainly affect the question would be greatly strengthened. It is obvious, for instance, that clandestine prostitution would indefinitely increase, and with it the direst ravages of disease.

Professor Amos, after having thus carefully taken his

---

\* *The Policy of the Contagious Diseases Acts, 1866 and 1869, Tested by the Principles of Ethical and Political Science.* By Sheldon Amos, M.A., Professor of Jurisprudence, University College, London. Ridgway, Piccadilly.



ground, proceeds to inquire, as we have done, into the general principle on which these Acts are based. He proposes three tests: Is the law favourable or not to the "moral" well-being of the whole community, using the term moral in its received scientific sense, irrespectively of any regard to the Divine Law? And is it conformable or not to a certain consciousness, call it the spirit, temper, or customary sentiments of the whole community, past and present, as exhibited in its system of law,—that is, is it, or is it not, constitutional? Lastly, does it or does it not offend against the wide principles of conscientious action by being unjust? We do not stay to criticise this phraseology. The meaning is sufficiently plain. Are these Acts moral, constitutional, just, judging them by much lower standards than those by which we feel bound to try them—standards, however, in these times, of almost universal appeal? We condense the replies to those questions.

On every conceivable theory of morals, prostitution is a flagrant moral evil. It undermines all our domestic institutions. It stimulates the lowest and most brutal part of our nature "to feed the selfish, the thoughtless, the unmerciful propensities; and it starves all that is generous, true, and tender-hearted." It allies itself with drunkenness, idleness, improvidence, and vanity. "It withers up or blasts all heroic national sentiments, and undoes far more than all that education, criminal-law-amendments, and genial human influence,"—we cannot help adding, religion itself,—“are struggling to effect.” But the State, by these Acts, recognises prostitution as a necessary and permanent fact, and, so far as they operate at all, renders it practicable, safe, and easy. It is not only that they do not create any sense of moral guilt; they weaken, if not destroy, it. There is yet another sense in which this legislation is immoral. Granted—and *we* grant it for the present purpose only—that it is not the province of law to teach morality. These Acts isolate one class of the community from all other classes. Such an isolation, it is true, is commonly consequent upon a breach of the criminal law. But the Acts do not treat prostitution as a crime. Those who approve of them are driven back to the contentions that the Acts are purely sanitary in their character. But how does this consideration affect the question? No sanitary measure deals with moral evil. Notwithstanding the various causes and conditions of prostitution, these Acts organise the unfortunate women who practise it into a separate class, all regarded and all treated alike. All moral

distinctions are ignored, and profligacy is measured, not by its inherent viciousness, but by the inconvenience it occasions to certain soldiers and sailors, whose health and lives are of value to the State.

And, next, these Acts are unconstitutional. "The concern," generally speaking, "hitherto exhibited by the Legislature for the personal liberty of the meanest citizen has been needlessly and recklessly lost sight of." Women whose moral turpitude widely differs are consigned to the charge of the police without any adequate, and, in many respects, without any possible, security against the irregular compromise of charges, extortion, malicious prosecutions, and other most probable abuses of the machinery of the Acts. And, again, whilst in the case of other offences their character admits of clear and cautious definition, no such definition, except one which is both arbitrary and complex, can be invented. There is, therefore, little, if any, chance of success in any prosecution for perjury; neither is there any protection in the average character of the subordinate police. And, once more, and specially, "the charge itself, even though finally disproved, carries with it its own penalty, whether in the form of bitter shame, or of an outrageous violation of person."

As to injustice, the term must be defined. "Unjust legislation is that which attaches disabilities and inconveniences to one class of persons in the community from which other classes, similarly situated in all respects, are exempt; or that which, while it attaches certain disabilities and inconveniences to one class of persons, for causes presumptively held sufficient, also attaches the self-same disabilities and inconveniences to other classes of persons, in whose case no such causes even presumptively exist." In both respects, these Acts are incapable of defence. Within the proscribed districts every pure woman is subjected to the same fear of police interference as any notorious prostitute. This fear, with the former equally with the latter, may end in bribery and compromise, or involuntary submission to examination, or in imprisonment, or in change of residence, or even in involuntary examination. Nor are men, good or bad, within the Acts.

We have surveyed this legislation on all sides, and with such calmness as the question permits. As Christians, as moralists, as jurists, we protest against it. We are astonished that, once fairly understood, any doubt should linger in the minds of benevolent and unprejudiced men. If, as we fear is the case, a large number of the members of the most humane of the

professions has hitherto sanctioned it, our solution of the problem is as easy to ourselves as it is honourable to them. They are conversant daily with the horrors of disease and death which vice engenders. They would fain see them mitigated, at almost any price, by almost any means. It does not, therefore, follow that they are necessarily safe guides when they dictate to us the best means of checking the evil.

But altogether repudiating, as we have done, all such supposed aids to morality, and to the mitigation of suffering, as the Acts we have been reviewing offer, we are still left open to the inquiry which discomfited quackery perpetually proposes to its detectors. What, then, have you no remedy for evils which yourselves admit to be so appallingly mischievous? There is a conclusive answer to such a question. Assuming that we could not suggest any certain, sovereign cure, that is no reason why we should administer what we know to be injurious, to aggravate the disorder, even if it do not kill the patient. But we do not admit that we are helpless.

To take the narrowest ground, and confining ourselves, as the supporters of these Acts have hitherto been compelled to confine themselves, at whatever sacrifice of consistency, to the particular cases of the army and navy, there is much that can be done, there is much actually doing, to meet the case. To employ and make interesting the leisure which soldiers and sailors, like all other leisurely people, are too apt to devote to bad uses; to create further facilities for marriage, and to foster a desire for it which, according to some authorities, does not now, to any considerable extent, exist; to educate, according to modern notions, and with modern appliances; above all, and without which all else were vain, with God's blessing upon considerate and continuous effort, to Christianise these men, not "natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed," but our brother men, separated from us, and specially imperilled, for our sake: these are obvious, and, speaking as to general results, certain remedies. It is true that the vice with which we are dealing is, in the very nature of things, about the most stubborn of the many with which religion and humanity are bound to cope. Drunkenness, its supposed rival both in attractiveness and danger, has no such hold upon men everywhere, and under all conditions of society. False religions readily recognise it as their own, sanction it, hold it out as a reward of faithfulness, make it part of their ritual and worship, and where, as in the case of Mormonism, a subtle

Erastianism smothers in one chaotic abyss all the distinctions between Church and State, lay it as the foundation of political prosperity. True religion,—the true religion under its many forms, finds in it a constant and insidious foe; and we add, in passing, sometimes trusts too much to the spirit of its teachings,—to their effect upon the conscience and whole life of the man,—instead of frequently and forcibly exposing and denouncing particular vices. But still Christianity,—the sense and fear of God our Father, as revealed to us in His Son by His Word,—Christianity calling to its aid, and employing in its service, all the resources of human sympathy and skill,—this will, sooner or later, prevail against even the strongest of sins, and so extirpate from society its bitterest woes.

Nor are there wanting, in the present instance, some significant indications of the mode in which this particular evil shall be mitigated, if not entirely destroyed. We do not undervalue the labours of those who, with whatever practical inconsistency, with whatever admixture of doctrines fatal to the very existence of society, yet confer on the nations the great practical benefit of perpetually reminding them of the ills and horrors of offensive wars. But war itself will be the great teacher of peace. Amidst all the thunder of battles, deafening us to all other sounds, we yet hear the voice which tries to teach us two, at least, great lessons. How utterly causeless are these contentions! How useless too! What political or social interests of the first promoters of the present conflict were in jeopardy? What will either party gain by it, except to have sown the seeds of future resentments and contests? Surely men will begin to ponder considerations like these, and to act upon them. And so standing armies, with their inseparable train of temptations and evils, may, while the stream of history runs so rapidly by, and long ere we are disposed now to hope, be diminished, and, it is not too much to say, finally dispensed with. Even before that time shall arrive, with the example of Germany before our eyes, surely statesmen will see that the best source of national defence lies not so much in the separation of special classes, but in the organisation of the masses of the people themselves; always ready, but probably never needed, to resist invasion; pursuing, for the most part, their ordinary industries; so instructed as to hate useless contentions; and, above all, fenced from the peculiar temptations of ordinary soldiery by the remembered sanctities of married and family life, and by the deep heart-yearning again and quickly to return to them.

ART. VII.—1. *History of the Karaite Jews.* By WILLIAM HARRIS RULE, D.D. London: Longmans. 1870.

2. *Geschichte des Karäerthums.* Von PROF. DR. JULIUS FURST. Leipzig. 1869.

KARAISM is the antithesis of Talmudism. What Protestants are to Popery, that those of the sons of Israel, whose motto is, "To the Law and to the Testimony: how readest thou?" are to the disciples of the Mishnah and Gemara. The Old Testament, and the Old Testament alone, is the religion of Karaites. They are the Readers—so their name imports—the Textuaries or Scripturists of Judaism, who know no Bible beyond the holy words of "Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms." Like Protestantism—born and half-grown up before it found its name; the child of religious earnestness stirred into life by sacerdotal frivolity and arrogance; identified against its will, in its early career, with alien or even antagonistic opinions and tendencies; not always preserving in its progress the happy mean between rigidity and latitudinarianism in dogmatic belief; often shivering in the rags of adversity, sometimes walking proudly in the golden slippers of wealth and distinction; seen now and again in kings' courts, though much more familiar with "caves and dens of the earth;" Karaism, through more than two thousand years, from the steppes of Turkestan to the banks of the Guadalquivir, and from the Russian snows to the bright lands of the Copt and the Moor, has steadfastly lifted its voice against Rabbinical assumption, and has taught the exclusive authority of Old Testament Scripture as the Oracles of God.

Considering the number and character of the points at which Karaite Judaism is in coincidence with Protestant Christianity, it is surprising how little attention has been given by Christian scholars and divines to this marked phase of Israelitish faith and life. Not only are the origin, history, and genius of Karaism in a multitude of respects Protestant—in view of the future, likewise, Karaism must be seen to hold very much the same relation to the corrupt Synagogue which Protestantism does to Romanism and other debased types of Christianity; and, on this account, it might be expected to have a special interest for those who believe that in the field of the world the wheat is yet destined to



outgrow the thorns, and, by outgrowing, to extinguish them. As matter of fact, Karaism, if it has not been absolutely a *terra incognita* to Christendom, has, till quite recently, been all but ignored in its literature. A Dutch scholar, Trigland, two centuries ago Professor of Theology at Leyden, may be considered the father of modern Karaistic learning, whether as prosecuted by Christians, or by Jews imbued with the liberal spirit of the recent European culture and civilisation. Trigland's *Diatribes de Secta Karæorum*, a work built on the authority of approved Karaite MSS., and on information supplied to the author by learned Karaites themselves, threw open a new world to the gaze of literary Europe, and has since served as a quarry from which later writers on Karaism have derived the bulk of their material. Still the subject has found attraction in but few eyes; and though the publication, in the year 1824, of part of Aaron ben Elijah's famous *Book of the Crown of the Law*, by Kosegarten, and only last year the appearance at Leipzig of the concluding volume of Fürst's elaborate *History of Karaism*, have helped still further to redeem the doctrines and fortunes of the Karaites from unmerited oblivion, the study of Karaism, as a great religious phenomenon and possible power, belongs to the time to come, and at present is only beginning to strip off its swaddling-bands. Dr. Rule has the honour of leading the way as the expositor of Karaism to Englishmen. Of the work named at the head of this article, he says, only too truly, "The book now presented to English readers is the first volume, in our language, that has been entirely devoted to the history of Karaite Jews."

The beginnings of Karaism lie within that confused and dreary period of Jewish history which stretches from the building of the second Temple to the time of Christ. As years rolled on, and as political and moral feebleness increased, the zeal which animated the early restorers of Judaism, after the exile, seems to have taken very much the evil direction of what is now known as Talmudic dogma, and, with this, of a minute and exacting ritualism, in which the simple institute of Moses was all but smothered and lost. To heighten the authority of the Law, a body of oral traditions, purporting to have come through an uninterrupted succession of chosen witnesses from the Holy Mount itself, and so claiming to be held as of co-ordinate rank with the Law, was conjured into existence, glossing, modifying, strengthening, enlarging, sometimes paring down the written records of the Pentateuch. These traditions—the Mishnah, or Double of the Law, they



were eventually called—originally, perhaps, the creation chiefly of that mysterious enthusiasm to which the lie is as good as the truth in the supposed interest of religion, afterwards, as circumstances might determine, the offspring of selfishness, pride, avarice, cunning, audacity, and infinite moral trifling, became in the end, either in reality or profession, the faith of the dominant classes among the Jews both in Church and State. Here was the Pharisaism, manifold in its parentage, multifiform in its aspects, diverse beyond calculation in its constituent elements, which Christ confronted and denounced, and which for a century before His coming, with less or more distinctness of definition, was the leading phase of Jewish opinion and practice. The ground, however, was not wholly in the hands of traditionists. On the practical side there was a reaction in the unworldly, self-renouncing, and sequestered brotherhood of the Essenes, the Quakers of Judaism. On the doctrinal side there was a reaction in the scepticism of the Sadducees, the Jewish representatives of the negative creed of Unitarianism. Once more, on the doctrinal and practical side together, Karaism, while it revolted against the pretended inspiration of the Mishnah, insisted that those who sat in Moses' seat were bound to echo the words of Moses, and that the justice, mercy, and love of God which Moses taught ought not to be disparaged and jeopardised by the insolence of human inventions.

Not that Karaism, under this or, so far as we know, under any other distinctive title, stood forth to view as a school or party among the Jews like Pharisaism or Sadduceeism, yet the thing existed, though the name was wanting; and in particular, two points in the history of the period now referred to may be noted at which not only a strong Karaite spirit may be recognised in the pre-Christian Judaism, but the nebulous elements likewise of the later schism may be observed in the act of condensing and solidifying themselves. When the Asmonean, Alexander Jannai, out-Heroded Herod beforehand by his wholesale butcheries of the Rabbis, and when his brother-in-law, Simon ben Shetakh,\* President of the Sanhedrim, like another Thomas à Becket, only rose the higher with the crisis, and taught his traditionalism with fresh intensity and vehemence, Simon's colleague, Judah ben Tabbai, vice-president, held and avowed opinions which approximated nearly to those afterwards formulated into the

\* Jewish tradition makes S. ben Shetakh responsible for the account which is usually given of the transmission of the Unwritten Law from Moses to the Sanhedrim.

creed of Karaism, and which found cordial acceptance with admiring disciples. Again, close upon the time of Our Lord, a similar, though much more pronounced Karaistic tendency exhibits itself in the relations which obtained between the teaching of the famous contemporaries, Hillel and Shammai. Of these Dr. Rule says :—

“ They were like Ben Shetakh and Ben Tabbai, president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim, the presidents being zealous supporters of the so-called Oral Law, and their colleagues not so much opponents in form as independent men who would not accept a tradition if it was not fairly to be reconciled with the sense and spirit of the Law of Moses, and the teaching of the Prophets. Hence they were not regarded as antagonists, although they generally disagreed, and sometimes their disciples carried the controversy from words to blows.”—*Hist.* p. 31.

“ To Hillel . . . is attributed the merit of first reducing tradition to a science. His classification of the Mishnah into six orders prepared the basis on which his successors laboured with a zeal that may engage admiration, and with a result that compels both admiration and regret. Shammai, his colleague, maintained a position of nearly equal eminence. His biography is not so splendid, but he exerted a counteractive influence which tended to save the Hebrew nation from sacrificing, in an excess of man-worship, some distinctive characteristics which the Christian world should be thankful to acknowledge on their behalf.”—*Hist.* p. 33.

Thus, then, it would seem that almost simultaneously with the rise of Talmudism in Palestine, some two or three centuries before Christ, the new tendency was opposed by men who, in the name of truth and virtue, protested against it; that, side by side with the growth and development of this great Judaic apostasy, there continued to be the assertion, less or more widely and emphatically, of the principle of a simple adherence to the inspired teaching of Moses and the Prophets; and that, when Christ appeared, both in high places and in low in the Jewish State, a considerable number of persons was to be found agreeing in certain particulars of theory or practice with Pharisee, Sadducee, and Essene alike, yet in fellowship with none of them; expressly identified with no recognised school of Jewish opinion, political or religious, but holding in common an attitude of resistance to the heightening tide of Rabbinism;\* and ready, under favouring circum-

---

\* Dr. Rule prefers the term *Rabbanism*, as marking better than *Rabbinism* the point of the quarrel which the Karaites have with the Talmudists as being Rabbanites, that is, Increasers or Enlargers of the Mosaic Law.

stances, to shape itself into the Karaite Synagogue of later times.

After the downfall of Jerusalem, North Palestine and Babylonia became the great centres of Jewish influence and learning, and, for several centuries, in one or both of these regions, Talmudic studies were prosecuted with amazing zeal and persistency. The spirit of traditionalism, so far from being checked by political disaster, seemed rather to gather strength with it; and the national energy, which had agonised in the long struggle with the Seleucids and the Romans, found resurrection in the weary erudition, the cunning dogmatics, the quaint conceits, and the limitless arguing and story-telling of the Mishnah and its commentaries. Tiberias was the chief seat of the Palestinian culture. Here Rabbi Judah the Holy is said to have completed and published the *Mishnah*, with the sanction of the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius (or Philosophus); and here, in the former half of the third century after Christ, the so-called Jerusalem Talmud was first given to the world. The glory of the Babylonian schools did not culminate till somewhat later. Nahardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha were the chief of these schools; and at Pumbeditha, late in the fifth century, or early in the sixth, the colossal Talmud, known as the Babylonian, the Talmud *par excellence*, was published under the hand of Rabbi Jose and his colleagues. Some extracts from Dr. Rule's description of the Jewish colleges on the Euphrates will enable us to bridge the gulf between the hazy morning of the history of Karaism and the clear light which breaks upon us some fifty or a hundred years after the appearance of the greater Talmud.

"Nahardea was once a strong city on the banks of the *nahar*, or canal, that united the Tigris and the Euphrates, north of Babylon, and had possessed a school from time immemorial; but the city and the school were greatly raised when a Babylonian Jew, named Samuel, who had been sent to Tiberias, and there studied under R. Judah the Holy, returned to his native country, rich in learning, being a clever astronomer, and conversant with his master's favourite study, the laws of the Mishnah. He was chosen rector of the school, which he governed with great success, was followed by others who upheld and even advanced its reputation, until Nahardea was sacked by an enemy, the school broken up, and the students dispersed over Babylonia, in the year of Our Lord 258. The school of Sora, . . . an old establishment, . . . pleasantly situated on the Euphrates, sometimes had a thousand, or even twelve hundred, students, with twenty *Amoras*, or Mishnaic doctors, who gave their instructions orally, after the Eastern manner. . . . On the death of R. Arekka,

the greatest rector of the school, the glory of Sora languished, and early in the fourth century it utterly expired.

"The school of Pumbeditha, a town situate at the mouth of the canal which once gave a name to Nahardea, was founded a few years before the dispersion of that population, under the guidance of R. Judah, the son of Ezekiel; both father and son being zealots for the Oral Law, and the whole family imbued with the same spirit of tradition. A thorough ecclesiastic, he was as much a pope in the synagogue as ever was an Innocent or a Benedict in the papal chair. He sternly enforced, not the statutes of Leviticus, but those of the fourth Order of the Mishna on *Injuries*. In language he was a Hebrew purist, and rejected the barbarous innovations which had reduced the speech of Moses and the prophets to a coarse jargon, made worse and worse as the Jew-boys flocked into Pumbeditha from the towns of Syria and Central Asia. As he advanced in life he plunged more deeply into the dark mysteries of 'the work of Genesis,' a book of Kabbalistic craft, which taught how to make a magical charm out of the letters of certain words in the First Book of Moses. So he pretended to unfold the mysteries of nature to hundreds of youths, who listened to the unintelligible utterances with wonder in proportion to their absurdity. Six devoted brothers squandered their energies in the same wild and objectless pursuit, and one of them is counted first contributor to the collection called *Midrash Rabbah*. They wrought hard in raking together extremely miscellaneous materials to swell the Talmud, and in endeavouring to reduce them into order after the several treatises.

"The rector of Pumbeditha was now a much greater personage than the *Resh Glutha*, or 'Head of the Captivity,' now but a helpless patriarch, without means of enforcing submission on twelve or thirteen thousand youths who crowded the schools, while masters were heaping up mountains of incomprehensible subtilty to be the future thesaurus of law, philosophy, and legend for all Judaism. While the masters were absorbed in this fruitless labour, the disciples spent their leisure in bragging insubordination to the one person who would fain be obeyed as sovereign of the Jews, and their scant hours of study were lost in acquiring a spurious dialectic which made people of the world stare, and gave rise to the proverb, 'Such an one comes from Pumbeditha, where they can drive a camel through the eye of a needle.'"—*Hist.* pp. 70—73.

The Karaistic opposition was not extinct while Talmudism was thus dominant. No doubt many of the Jews who fled from Palestine during the war with Rome were Karaite in feeling, and in their migrations and ultimate settlements planted the seeds of what eventually became Karaite organisations and communities. Nor did the Traditionists find a clear field within the immediate area of their scholastic activity and conventional influence. The Talmudic Church of

Judaism, like the Papal Church of Christianity, was plagued and thwarted by pestilent heretics, who would ask troublesome questions, and who were perpetually calling God to witness against men who turned His temple into a toy shop and a den of thieves. Evidence is not wanting that, all through this golden age of Talmudism, in Palestine, in Babylonia, and in other parts of Asia and Europe, Karaite principles were maintained and promulgated, and that in some cases very wide-spread and powerful reactions against the ascendant system were preparing the way for that disruption of the Synagogue which followed in its season. We have an instance in the Paschal controversy of the fourth century. In the year 360, the celebrated Hillel, of Tiberias—to quote Dr. Rule—

“Made a revision of the Jewish method of determining the length of the year, and appointing the Feast of the Passover. In his calculation and its result he followed the Christians, who had learned this more correct system from the Greeks. Hillel, being president of the Sanhedrim, engaged that venerable council to join him in giving the adoption of the new system the highest sanction that could be found in all Jewry, and the majority of synagogues received their decision without the slightest difficulty. But there was a multitude of Jews so accordant in principle as to need no organisation for united resistance. They did not acknowledge the right of the Sanhedrim to supersede the explicit directions given in the Law for new moons and festivals. They would not depart from the letter of that Law.”—*Hist.* p. 65.

Indeed, to such a pitch of excitement did the spread of Traditionalism rouse very many of the Western Jews, that, in February, 529, only a few years after the publication of the completed Talmud, the Emperor Justinian found it necessary, in the interest of the public peace, to issue a constitution, directed, among other things, against the preaching of the Mishnah and Gemara in the synagogues:—

“‘The *Δευτεριώτικ*, as it is called among them,’ which meant the *Mishnah*, the secondary Law, as explained by Talmudists,—‘we utterly prohibit, as it neither agrees with the Holy Scripture, nor was it handed down by the Prophets from above, but is the invention of men who speak from the earth only, and have not one thing that is divine in them. Therefore, let them read only the words that are sacred, opening the sacred books themselves, and not concealing what is said in them, nor bringing in vain words that were written *elsewhere*,’—written in Babylonian manuscripts,—‘contrived for the purpose of setting aside the plainer words which they’ (the sacred books) ‘contain’ . . . . ‘And we beseech those who hear the

Holy Scriptures read in this language (Greek) or in that (Hebrew) to be on their guard against the wickedness of those interpreters, and let them not confine themselves to the mere letters,—the Kabbalistic follies of Pumbeditha,—‘but rather get a taste of the things themselves, and gain a perception of the inner meaning.’—*Hist.* p. 78.

Thus, as Dr. Rule says, “the masters of Talmud found that,” while they were unable, within their own charmed circle, to spirit away the genius of heresy, “the Hebrew synagogues beyond the Euphrates and the Tigris, the Greek-speaking Jews on the Nile, and the remote captivities on the Volga and the Danube, were so far apart in all respects, except their universally recognised descent from Jacob, . . . that they could not be brought into a simultaneous movement, not even in obedience to those great Eastern masters on whom the wisdom of Daniel was supposed to rest.”

The want of historic light forbids our marking, with any distinctness, the course of the internal struggles of Judaism for some time after the convulsion caused by the aggressions of the Talmudic Propaganda. It is certain, however, that the protest of a still unnamed and, comparatively speaking, unorganised Karaism was wide-spread, resolute, persevering, and, in some instances, completely triumphant. Towards the middle of the eighth century the light suddenly strengthens, and two phenomena reveal themselves, each serving to establish the fact of a mighty previous march of Karaite principles in the Jewish world, while one of them constitutes the epoch to which Karaites usually refer as the birthday of the formal and final disruption between themselves and the rest of their brethren of the Synagogue.

Of the phenomena in question, the first is the fact that, at this time, Jews holding Karaite sentiments were a well-known and influential religious body in the ancient, and now all but forgotten, kingdom of the Chozars on the north-west of the Caspian Sea; the other is the great Karaistic movement in Babylonia, Syria, and other parts of the East, which connects itself with the name of the famous Ahnan ben David, regarded, though erroneously, by many as the original founder of the Karaite system.

Very little is known either of the personal history of Ahnan or of the circumstances under which he became so prominent a figure in the history of Karaism.\* According to Karaite

\* The main authority for this passage in the history of Karaism is the celebrated and very curious *Sepher Chozri*, a work originally written in Arabic, translated into Hebrew in the twelfth century, some four hundred years after



authorities, he was born in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, but settled in Babylonia, where he distinguished himself by the ability and success with which he opposed the Talmud, and expounded the Mosaic Law "according to the doctrine of the tradition of the Karaites." Subsequently—A.D. 761 is the Karaite date—he returned to Jerusalem, accompanied by a multitude of enthusiastic disciples, and organised a missionary agency designed to strengthen, extend, and create new centres for the influence of Karaistic opinions. Amongst other means employed for the purpose, "letters of admonition, instruction, and encouragement [were sent] to distant congregations," with zealous preachers, who proclaimed everywhere the supreme authority of the Law, and the worthlessness of all that, in the Talmud or any other writings, was contrary to it. Ahnan is said to have died at Jerusalem, in the year 765, leaving behind him two works at least, a *Book of Precepts* and a *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, of each of which portions are still extant.

The exact relation which Ahnan held to the historic development of Karaism is hardly to be stated with precision. The fact, however, that he is universally recognised by the Karaite communities as the chief of their fathers,\* suffices to show that he gave a strong and lasting impulse to Jewish Protestantism. And it is certain, that from about the period

---

its composition, by the distinguished Spanish Rabbi, Judah the Levite, and published at Basle in the year 1660, with a Latin version, by the younger Buxtorf.

\* The Karaites do not regard Ahnan as their original founder, still less have they ever called themselves after him. Yet they hold him in high honour, and his name takes precedence of every other in the *Zikronoth* or memorial-prayers which are read in their synagogues every Sabbath. The following beautiful and affecting formula is Ahnan's *Zikron*:—"May our God, and the God of our fathers, have compassion on our dead, and on your dead, and on the whole dead of all His people, the House of Israel, chiefly and before all on our Rabbi Ahnan the Prince, a man of God, head of the captivity, who opened the way of the Law, and enlightened the eyes of the Sons of the Reading, and converted many from iniquity and from transgression, and guided us in the right way. May the God of Israel make him to lodge in a good resting-place; in a pleasant resting-place may he have his dwelling with the seven companies of righteous men who are waiting in the Garden of Eden, and may there be fulfilled on him the Scripture that is written:—'And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse that shall stand for an ensign to the nations, to him shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious' (Is. xi. 10). 'The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall He thunder upon them; the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth, and He shall give strength unto His King, and exalt the horn of His anointed' (1 Sam. ii. 10). 'His enemies will I clothe with shame, but upon himself shall his crown flourish' (Ps. cxxxii. 18). And yet may God fulfil on him the Scripture that is written—'And thou, go thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days' (Dan. xii. 13)."—*Hist.* p. 118.

to which his life and labours are referred, Karaism finally assumed that definite and independent form throughout the world which it has ever since presented.

Did opportunity serve, it would be interesting to map out the parts of Jewry occupied by the Karaites in the time of Ahnan; to follow, down the course of the centuries, the shifting fortunes of the brotherhood, as it expanded in this direction, or shrank in that, here blazed into splendour, and here grew dim and vanished; to describe, with Fürst, the personal career and literary labours of the great scholars and teachers whose names embellish the Karaite annals; and to discuss a number of questions, some of them not a little curious and important, suggested by the history, *e.g.* the relation between Karaism and Christianity during the first three hundred years of our era; the influence which Karaism, in Germany, Spain, and elsewhere, may have exerted upon the Lutheran Reformation; and the extent to which Karaism, properly so called, has originated, intensified, or become absorbed in that widely extended revolt against the Talmud, which marks the Judaism of the present age. With regard to the questions now named, it must suffice to have pointed them out as subjects well worthy the consideration of Church historians, and of all persons interested in the religious welfare of the Jews. Nor can we add much to what has already been indicated as to the progress, spread, or decline of Karaism from the days of Ahnan downwards. The four or five centuries following the eighth seem to have been the golden age of Karaism. During this period influential Karaite communities were to be found in Tartary, Turkey, Russia, Poland, Spain, and many other parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Karaite writers name the end of the fourteenth century and the opening of the fifteenth as marking the commencement of an era of decline for their system. In the most recent times the true Karaism—that which has descended from the fathers, as distinguished from its modern representatives under other forms and names—has dwindled down into very scanty dimensions, and has its chief habitat in Polish Russia, in the Crimea, and in certain other remote corners of the ancient domain of Judaism. A passage or two from Dr. Rule's *History* will serve at once to illustrate some of the foregoing statements, and to exhibit, as in a panorama, the character and life of the Karaites as they have been and as they are.

In the autumn of A.D. 1641 a Karaite Rabbi, Samuel the Holy by name, paid a visit to his brethren in Egypt, and

Dr. Rule gives us the following graphic account of the Rabbi's experiences as he himself described them :—

“ The Egyptian Jews received him well on his arrival at Cairo, and conducted him to the house of the Karaite Nasi (Prince), whose name was Baruch, a Rabbi, who gave him and his fellow-travellers honourable entertainment.

“ He commends them highly for exemplary conduct, liberality, humility, benevolence towards all their neighbours, and piety towards God. He relates how carefully they observed all that is commanded in God's most holy Law, walking aright in the way of truth, and keeping the holy Sabbath, with observance of sacred ritual therein. On the Sabbath-day they lit no lamps, nor tasted any hot food, but fires and lights were burning on the eves of holy days, and the lamps in the synagogues kept burning from nightfall until morning light. Like all good Jews, they were very scrupulous in the preparation of their food, and beyond all others careful that the animal to be slaughtered should be free from the slightest blemish. They would not accept food of any kind from the Mohammedans, except only vegetables or fruits; neither would they take from Rabbanites bread, nor wine, nor mead, if they were to offer it. They would have no fellowship with them, would not intermarry, nor eat or drink together. This rigid separation, however, was the more easy, as the Karaites in Egypt were very numerous in Cairo, had butchers and bakers of their own, and dealers in every kind of food. As the Jews of sixteen centuries before their time would have no dealings with Samaritans, so neither would these Karaites deal in any way with those Rabbanites. They did not regard them as true Israelites nor lawful Jews. So these, the *Karaim*, were by eminence ‘ the Egyptian Jews ! ’

“ R. Samuel reports that they were poor indeed, but not second to any people for honesty. Their fathers had not been so poor. Their chief synagogue was handsome; it rested on fourteen marble pillars, and had five *arks* and fourteen rolls of the Law. The library belonging to the synagogue contained many Karaite books in Arabic manuscript. In the court of one Aaron there was a lesser synagogue, with two rolls of the Law and other books. There were also smaller houses, or oratories, set apart for prayer. In former times there had been seventy oratories, but the number was then reduced to fifty.

“ Most remarkable of all was a house devoted to purposes of religion, having a lofty tower, which the early Karaites used as an observatory to watch for the new moons. Rabbi Samuel, ascending the tower, counted ninety steps above the house-roof. Every Sabbath and feast-day they brought out the rolls of the Law with great ceremony, and read the appointed Parashah with profound solemnity. On other days it was their custom to read the same at home, but without limiting themselves to the order of reading, and also the

Haphtaroth. The same things, as they heard, were done in Jerusalem and in Damascus by the Karaites of those cities.

"R. Samuel and his party visited Old Cairo also, where was a synagogue originally belonging to the Karaites, but then in possession of the Rabbanites, who would not now suffer them so much as to look upon the Book or the Law. They longed to see it, and offered a handsome present to the keeper of the place; but no money would bribe him to allow, as he fancied, the desecration of that sacred object by even the sight of the eye of those brethren who would have laid down their lives rather than erase or change a letter of it. But they bore the denial patiently, sang plaintive Hebrew hymns in the synagogue which centuries before had resounded with their fathers' hallelujahs, gave the man money to buy oil for the lamps, offered prayer which no custodian could hinder, and withdrew in sadness. The doors of their Talmudist brethren were closed, but an Arab entertained them in the city. The Mussulman gave them food which they did not then refuse, and a lodging which they gratefully enjoyed. Next morning their host took them out of the city of the Pharaohs into a delicious Egyptian garden, where the sons of Ishmael accepted entertainment in return from the son of Isaac,—the children of the bondwoman were comforted by the son of the free."

Djufut-Kalè in the Crimea is one of the most ancient known settlements of the Karaites. In the year 1821 the late Dr. Henderson visited the place, and Dr. Rule reproduces part of his account of what he found there:—

"Like other visitors, he was very hospitably welcomed by the Chief Rabbi, who showed him a good library, containing, among other volumes, of which he preserved no account, the Talmud. There were several commentaries of the Law, said to be written by Karaites, and some on other portions of the Old Testament. Each of the two synagogues was well supplied with Hebrew Bibles and Prayer-books, and copies of the Judæo-Tartar version of the Bible were in use by the congregation.

"Above two hundred and fifty families, exclusively Karaite, dwelt within the walls, all being engaged in trade. Some of the people went to business every morning in Baghtchisarai, and returned in the evening. Some travelled into Russia and Poland as traders, and some took voyages to Odessa. They had shops, or branch establishments, in the several commercial centres. Members of their families being consequently resident in all those places, and precluded by the strict rules of their religion from intimate relation with even other Jews, they must have congregated everywhere in sufficient numbers to carry on a kind of domestic commerce among themselves, and to have their own synagogues.

"Behind the town, in a beautiful valley or depressed plain, sheltered by surrounding hills, is the resting-place of their dead; an ancient cemetery, with tombstones having inscriptions legible after

exposure to the weather of that fitful and tempestuous climate during, as they said, five hundred years ; but later information proves that that date was altogether underrated, and that inscriptions were to be found, whether above ground or buried, dated 1,500 years or more before the Doctor's visit. They called that cemetery the Valley of Jehoshaphat. Kalè still enjoyed privileges granted by the Khan of the Crimea, Hadji Selim Gherei, about the middle of the eighteenth century, in consequence of the cure of his sister, who was recovered from a dangerous illness by the successful treatment of one of their physicians. By virtue of this grant, the gates of the city and fort were closed on the Sabbath-days,—that is to say, from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday,—in strict conformity with the ordinance of Nehemiah (xiii. 19). In all respects they obeyed the Divine injunction, conveyed in the words of Isaiah (lviii. 13, 14), and were rewarded with a literal fulfilment of the promise, if no more. . . . In their practical recognition of the sanctity of the Sabbath institution, they were described by this visitor as very superior to the Russian Jews in general, who convert the day into a season of mere sensuous delight, with feasting and conviviality.”—*Hist.* pp. 187—9.

Of the Russian Karaites in general, Dr. Henderson took a highly favourable impression. He says:—

“The Karaites are free from many of the superstitions to be found among the Jews in general, such as the transmigration of souls, the power of talismans, &c. ; and, as might naturally be expected from their principles, the standard and tone of morals which their general deportment exhibits is quite of a different stamp from that of the Rabbanists. In their persons they are tidy ; their domestic discipline and arrangements are correct and exemplary, and their dealings with others are characterised by probity and integrity. It is one of their favourite maxims that those things which a man is not willing to receive himself, it is not right for him to do to his brethren—a maxim strictly corresponding with Matt. vii. 12. How far the Karaites act up to this principle may be ascertained by the fact that they are universally respected by all who know them ; and I never yet heard any person speak ill of them, except he was a bigoted adherent of the Talmud. In the south of Russia, where they are best known, their conduct is proverbial, and I cannot place it in a stronger light than by recording the testimony borne to it by a Polish gentleman in Dubno, who informed me that, while the other Jews resident in Lutzk are constantly embroiled in suits at law, and require the utmost vigilance on the part of the police, there is not a single instance of prosecution recorded against the Karaites for the space of several hundred years, during which they have been settled in that place.”—*Henderson's Biblical Researches in Russia*, chap. xiv., quoted by Dr. Rule [*Hist.* p. 189].

Speaking again of Djufut-Kalè, Dr. Rule pictures one of the

latest phases of Karaism as seen in this sequestered seat of its former power:—

“During the last war with Russia, when the combined forces of Turkey, England, and France were in the Crimea, and some Jews in Paris obtained the friendly assistance of the French military authorities for instituting inquiries concerning the state of their Karaite brethren in that peninsula, their chief attention was directed to the ancient city of Djufut-Kalè, then suffering much in consequence of the war. The 250 families were reduced to 100, if, indeed, the 300 old men, widows, and children that remained after the able-bodied men and younger women had fled could be clustered into the shape of families. There were only two principal persons remaining. One was Benjamin Aga, Prince of the Karaites, who had his residence there, and had formerly received the Emperor Joseph of Austria and the Emperor Alexander I. of Russia. The other was Rabbi Beym, who sustained the two-fold dignity of civil governor and Chief Rabbi, being about forty-five years of age, and well-educated, speaking Hebrew and German besides his vernacular Tartar. Alexander I., Nicholas, Alexander, Nicholaiwitch, the Empress, and some Imperial Highnesses had been his guests, and all accounts concur in representing him as well able to receive his numerous visitors of rank with courteous hospitality,

“The French inquirers found the ancient place exactly as Dr. Henderson had described it—seated on a calcareous rock, 2,000 feet above the level of the sea, and consisting of humble habitations sufficient for 3,000 inhabitants, of whom only about a third were ordinarily present. They were informed that the aged, having accumulated wealth as travelling merchants in Russia for the most part, or in Constantinople, or in Egypt, usually came back to spend their last days in the only city in the world that is exclusively their own. It is their Jerusalem. There they endeavour to assimilate their religious services to those of the old Jerusalem, in the time of the second Temple, and, so far as that can be lawfully attempted, they approach to a resemblance. A fruitful hill, which rises boldly from the level of the table-land behind the little city, is to them a Mount of Olives. A deep ravine below reminds them of Kedron. Their vast cemetery, magnificently solemn, city of their slumbering dead, with its 40,000 tombs at the surface, resting on layers of tombs beneath the surface, substructed, as it were, floor under floor, each chamber with its tenant irremovable until the day when the trumpet shall awake them all, wonderfully strengthens the resemblance to that holy city, with its yet more ancient Valley of Jehoshaphat, which very name it borrows. There, as is now reported, may be seen the tomb of that zealous propagandist, the Rabbanite Isaac Sangari, who converted the Chozar king to the religion of the Talmud, to whose body their fathers did not refuse a grave.”—*Hist.* p. 191.

The religious belief of the Karaites, though not without its



tinature of traditional error, contrasts favourably, as might be expected, with the creed of the Talmudists. The Old Testament alone, as we have seen, is their Bible. They call it not only *The Law*, but *The Reading*, because it is the duty and privilege of all Israelites to read it for themselves, and so learn the will of God. They do not, like the Samaritans, limit the inspiration of Scripture to the Books of Moses. They speak of *The Twenty-four Books*, or *The Holy Books*, including the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Psalms. "They make no mention of Apocrypha. They have translated the Old Testament into vernacular languages, especially Arabic and Greek, and, in later times, into Tartar." Yet they distinguish carefully between the Versions and the Original, and take great pains to teach their children Hebrew, and to impress upon them the necessity of guarding every jot and tittle of the sacred text from corruption. Their canon of Biblical interpretation is one which deserves the attention of some who are not Jews. "They say that they carry in their hands two lamps--the lamp of the Law and the lamp of intellect. They believe that God will impart the spirit of prophecy to enable them to use the lamps aright."

Dr. Rule translates the ten Fundamental Articles of the Karaite creed, or confession, as found in their Liturgy, thus:—

"1. That all this bodily (or material) existence, that is to say, the spheres and all that is in them—are created.

"2. That they have a Creator, and the Creator has His own soul (or spirit).

"3. That He has no similitude, and He is one, separate from all.

"4. That He sent Moses, our Master, upon whom be peace.

"5. That He sent with Moses, our Master, His Law, which is perfect.

"6. For the instruction of the faithful, the language of our Law, and the interpretation, that is to say, the Reading (or Text), and the division (or vowel-pointing). \*

"7. That the Blessed God sent forth the other prophets.

"8. That God—blessed be His name—will raise the sons of men to life in the Day of Judgment.

"9. That the Blessed God giveth to man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.

"10. That the Blessed God has not reprobated the men of the captivity, but they are under the chastisements of God, and it is

\* There is reason to believe that the Karaites had a principal hand in the framing of the Hebrew vowel-characters, if they were not absolutely the inventors of them. Dr. Rule devotes a chapter to this subject. It is one of high interest, and calls for fuller investigation.

every day right that they should obtain His salvation by the hands of Messiah, the Son of David."—*Hist.* pp. 128-9.

Like other Jews, they pray for the dead. At the same time they hold, with an inconsistency which, in common with certain other religionists, they are not concerned to be rid of, that, as one of their own commentators has it, "the soul, if it be pure, shall ascend, after death, into the intellectual world, which is called *the world to come* and *the garden of Eden*, to live there for ever; but if it be guilty, and driven out of its habitation on account of transgressions, it shall live in anguish and shame in that place where the worm will not die, and where the fire will not be quenched, and this is the valley of Hinnom, *Gehenna*." As to the Messiah, the Karaites believe "He may be expected any moment, because it is written that He will come suddenly to His temple. Some of them, seeing that no new Messiah does come, assign a strange reason for His non-appearance. 'He lingers,' one of them has said, 'because Saturn, the Sabbath-Star, is the star of Israel, and the astronomers tell us that that star moves slowly in its orbit. Therefore, when the end arrives, but not before, by the will of God He will come.' But again they say,—speaking in a better spirit indeed, but coming no nearer to the truth,—that the fault of this delay is in the banished Jews themselves, whose sins are the only obstacle; and then, again, they reason themselves into the semblance of a hope, for as this obstacle would cease if the guilty would repent, it is every day right, they think, that they should obtain the salvation of the Lord."\*

We cannot follow Dr. Rule in the account which he gives of Karaite ritual and custom. Still less can we enter upon those wide and tempting fields of the Karaite literature, to which we are invited alike by our English and German guides. We heartily thank Dr. Rule for challenging the attention of Englishmen, as he does, by his interesting and suggestive volume, to a much neglected province in the history of religion and of mankind. It is possible that, in a second edition—soon, we hope, to be called for—he may think it desirable to rearrange, or even recast, certain portions of the work as it now stands. Persons unused to Rabbinical studies, such as those amongst which Dr. Rule is completely at home, may be disposed, in reading the history, to complain sometimes of an obscurity and confusion which would disappear under a different presentation of the writer's facts and arguments. A

---

\* *Hist.* pp. 133-4.

freer use of dates, too, will add much to the value of the work in the hands of most of Dr. Rule's readers.

It has not come within our purpose to discuss Dr. Fürst's more ample and detailed survey of Karaism. Unfortunately, his work is blemished by a theory—successfully combated by Dr. Rule—which makes the Karaite-system an outgrowth and development of the pre-Christian Sadduceeism. But his volumes are rich in research on all points relating to the literary history of the Karaites; and no student of the origin, genius, and historic life of this wonderful branch of the most wonderful of all the stocks of human kind can dispense with their assistance. It will be a discredit to English scholarship, and a wrong to the cause of truth and of general enlightenment, if Dr. Fürst's *Geschichte des Karäerthums* does not soon appear among us in a language “understood of the people.”

---

ART. VIII.—*Lothair*. By the Right Honourable B. D'ISRAELI. Sixth Edition. Longmans. 1870.

IT is no wonder that *Lothair* was looked for with the keenest interest; that curiosity and wonder were wide awake for its reception. Its author had in earlier years written many novels; had forced his way upwards from the position of an attorney's clerk to that of the Parliamentary leader of the most fastidious and aristocratic political party in the world; had in his latest novels, more than twenty years ago, portrayed or caricatured political characters with an audacious fidelity, or an audacious exaggeration, as the case might be, and yet had, with the good fortune which not seldom attends audacity, been able to turn to account his brilliant satire for his purposes at the time as a leader of the "Young England" party in Parliament; had, to the astonishment of everyone, entered, all at once, into high political office under the Earl of Derby, that office being, as if to confound all men by an intellectual *tour-de-force*, by an ostentatious and most daring versatility, the commercial, plodding post of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in this capacity had led the House of Commons; had thenceforward, in spite of the antipathy of race, culture, temperament, prejudice, and tendency, between himself and the party he led, in spite of their unconcealed dislike of their leader, maintained his place at the head of the Tory party, as the one man whose genius was adequate to the task of upholding their controversy against the tide of the time and the great powers of the Liberal leaders, and of shaping the policy by which they might keep a position in the country; had, by his subtlety, skill, and boldness, secured for his party the ambiguous fame which belonged to carrying the Reform Bill; had refused a peerage for himself, but secured one for his wife; on the retirement from public life, soon followed by the death, of Lord Derby, had succeeded to the undisputed leadership of his great party; had thus held for many years a foremost place as a political leader in the British Empire, his early literary performances being, as it seemed, altogether of the distant past, passages only of that struggling life of a single-handed adventurer of alien blood, out of which he had so wonderfully fought his way upward;—when, lo! the world is startled by the announcement of a new novel forthcoming from the pen of the author of *The Wondrous Tale of Alroy*, of *Henrietta Temple*, of *Contarini Fleming*, of

*Coningsby*, from the pen of the leader of the Tory party in the English nation.

We can well conceive that Mr. D'Israeli and his Viscountess may have often talked over the idea of writing another novel, when the season of his retirement from the active work of administration might appear to have begun. Thus to link his later to his earlier history,—to show how unbroken, how unaltered, is his own individuality,—to reflect back on the career and position of the novelist, from which he climbed into the seat of the minister of state, some of the splendour that belongs to his consummated fortunes,—may have been a characteristic element in the special ambition of the "Semitic" adventurer. His own career has realised the strangest improbabilities; his final transmutation, by mere dint of genius, without official patronage or any professional training, from the scrivener's grade, in which he began life, into the character which he now brilliantly sustains, of statesman, courtier, and man of society, is as wonderful as any romance, and may excuse, and in some degree account for, the dyes of romantic extravagance in which he steeps the pictures which he paints. We remember no life-story in Europe, on the whole, so strange, except that of Napoleon III.; scarcely one so obstinately gallant, against overwhelming difficulties and discouragements at first, and at the same time so splendidly successful.\* We know of no triumph so great in the field of English politics except that of John Bright. John Bright's, indeed, has been a far purer and nobler success than the ex-Premier's. He has fought his battle steadfastly along one line—the line of broad liberty, political and economical. By dint of great sagacity, unflinching courage, unwavering consistency, admirable power of argument, by resolute self-culture and undaunted self-reliance, by the highest eloquence, couched in the clearest, purest English, and by an unstained personal character, the small Quaker manufacturer of Rochdale has fought a victorious fight against all the power and prejudice of the English landed interest and great aristocracy, and now takes his place among the chief ministers of the nation and the Crown. The Semitic adventurer has proved himself to be a subtle calculator—has trained himself to be a successful debater. He made himself first useful to a great party, which stood in need of genius to light and lead it; he at once served them, and gratified his own disappointed spleen by his savage but unrivalled invectives against Sir Robert Peel and his new

\* Since the above was written, the Emperor has fallen *perhaps* not to rise again.

free-trade policy ; having made himself useful and agreeable, he came presently to be indispensable. In a word, he saddled and mounted the Tory party, without their being aware of the operation which he was performing, that he might pleasantly guide them to power and place ; and afterwards, when his seat was firm, neither could they shake him off, nor anyone else guide them successfully but this wary and skilful rider. On this wise has D'Israeli made himself the political master of the aristocracy of England. Bright, on the other hand, has met in political conflict them and him together ; and though outwearied with the struggle, and bearing its dints upon his constitution and his brain, has remained confessed victor of the field. If D'Israeli's has been the stranger, the more subtle, the more cunning and dazzling success, Bright's has been much the grander and nobler, and not the less really wonderful.

Though, as we have said, the Viscountess of Beaconsfield may often have heard her husband talk over the project of some new, and perhaps last, romance, by which to give the world a fresh surprise, to vindicate for himself a persistent originality and individuality, and to connect his final stage of success in public life, and in society, with his early stages of struggle ; yet it is evident that the actual conception of the story of *Lothair* must have been altogether recent. In the year 1869, the English world was ringing with the news of the perversion to Rome of the more than millionaire Marquis of Bute, within a few months after his majority had been celebrated with unparalleled largesse and splendour. That the hint of the story of *Lothair*, who is all but perverted, and the magnificent festivities connected with whose majority occupy so large a space in the novel, was borrowed from the history of the Marquis of Bute, no one can doubt. Not long after the story of this nobleman's perversion had filled the trumpet of rumour, and had echoed along the news-channels of the world, Mr. D'Israeli was on a visit at Alton Towers, the romantic and splendid domain of the Earls of Shrewsbury, from which it is but a drive to Trentham, the celebrated seat of the Dukes of Sutherland. No one who knows Alton Towers and Trentham can fail to recognise in them the originals of Muriel Towers and Brentham. We can hardly be wrong, accordingly, in connecting the conception of *Lothair* with the author's visit to Alton Towers.

*Lothair* has been truculently reviewed in *Blackwood*, severely criticised in the *Quarterly*, more than half-condemned in the *Edinburgh* ; has been judicially approved by scarcely any competent reviewer, notwithstanding the chorus of praise



which burst forth, on its publication, from newspaper critics on almost all sides round. We confess, however, that we incline, on the whole, much more to praise than to censure. We think better of Mr. D'Israeli after reading it than we did before. We do not know that our admiration for his mere intellectual powers is enhanced. We cannot, indeed, but admire the prodigious vigour, vivacity, and versatility which such a work shows in one who has for so many years sustained the grave anxieties of a party-leader in Parliament, who has not published a literary work for more than twenty years, and who has attained to the age of sixty-five. There is an almost juvenile buoyancy, a sanguine geniality, a breadth of speculative sympathy, a power of cosmopolitan intelligence, which is truly wonderful in the veteran man of letters, of politics, and of fashionable life. But what most attracts us in the book, and makes us like the author better than we did before, is the combination of kindness of tone with wholesomeness of sentiment which, to our thinking, marks it as a whole.

Mr. D'Israeli professes to be an English Tory, yet he sketches Mazzini and his ideas, not only without prejudice, but with a certain sympathy and admiration. His "divine Theodora," his favourite heroine, is an impersonation of the modern idea, we might almost call it religion, of the sacredness and indestructibility of nationality. He describes, evidently *con amore*, the sensuous ideas of modern art-and-beauty-worship, yet he does this without a taint of sensuality; and, in the end, he makes it to be seen and felt that this theory is an unreality, a romantic extravaganza, a half-pagan dream, which thoroughly to exhibit must be effectually to satirise and virtually to condemn. He leads his hero through many speculations, but he brings him clearly out on to the *terra firma* of orthodox Christianity. He does justice to the high personal character of English lay-perverts, and the better class of Roman Catholics; yet he makes his book to be a warning against the subtle policy and unrelenting purpose of Roman ecclesiastics. We doubt, indeed, whether he has not carried his depiction of the proselytising unscrupulousness of the Anglican priest-pervert, in one instance, decidedly too far.

The book, indeed, is a superficial book. There are many vivid antitheses and brilliant phrases; there are not wanting here and there serious discussions, and weighty and penetrating thoughts. But, on the whole, *Lothair* is superficial. We are not sure, however, that this is any fault of the work. Perhaps it is even a merit. *Lothair* is partly a satire and

partly a romance; and where it is most imaginatively and wildly romantic, it scarcely, at any point, ceases to be a satire. It was meant to leave ideas and lessons behind it; but it was meant to do this in a pleasant and entertaining way, so that more may be learnt than seems to be taught.

There is one respect, indeed, in which the want of seriousness and earnest purpose in most of the characters which figure in *Lothair* seems, at first sight, to be unaccountable, and the reverse of creditable, if not to the author, then assuredly to the great party, and the aristocratic order, of which he might be supposed to be the sworn champion. Here is a book in which hereditary legislators figure largely. Dukes, marquises, peers of different orders, young noblemen who hold seats in the House of Commons, are almost the only company, besides artists and enthusiasts, with whom we have intercourse so long as we keep company with *Lothair*. We are with them at home and abroad, at the club, in the drawing-room, on horseback and on foot, in the park, the pleasure-ground, the garden, in town and country. They talk in our hearing about dinners, dancing, jewels, art, the theatre, religion, this last at large; they meet their business man and talk about their rent-rolls and estates; *Lothair* himself attains to his majority, takes pains to master the category of his estates, dignities, revenues, and responsibilities, seriously considers his religious obligations at a season of his life and under circumstances so important, and celebrates the event by *fêtes* of fabulous magnificence, by formally entering into relations with his tenants, with the lord lieutenant and the sheriff of the county, with the bishop of the diocese, and by religious services, which are sealed and consummated by early communion on the morning of the decisive natal day: and yet throughout the whole of the three volumes (with a single exception which we shall immediately note) not one of all these characters, not even *Lothair*, the conscientious hero, under such circumstances as we have described, ever converses, even for an instant, on any question of public philanthropy, of social economics, or of political science. Only in the one instance we have now to mention is any great social duty or obligation of a landed magnate glanced at, and that instance is the following:—*Lothair*, still at Oxford, and, as it would seem, barely twenty years of age, is visiting Brentham, and has fallen in love with the Lady Corisande, one of the three heroines of the story, the one to whom, after many vacillations and risks, he is in the end happily married. He is about to break to the Duchess, Lady

Corisande's beautiful mother, the secret of his passion for her daughter, and to ask (very prematurely) permission to pay his addresses to her. Under these circumstances, the Oxford man shows a hopeful sensibility in regard to his future obligations as a landlord, from which one might fairly have augured that some degree of earnest social benevolence might have been expected to be shown within the circle of brilliant patricians with whom afterwards in Lothair's society we are to spend so much of our time. Lothair speaks to the Duchess of "the extinction of pauperism," as, to quote his very words, "that to which I really wish to devote my existence, and in which I instinctively feel Lady Corisande would sympathise with me." Then follows a passage in which the young nobleman rather cleverly leads the conversation back to the tenderly interesting point from which it had started :—

"'That is a vast subject,' said the Duchess.

"'It is the terror of Europe, and the disgrace of Britain,' said Lothair, 'and I am resolved to grapple with it. It seems to me that pauperism is not an affair so much of wages as of dwellings. If the working classes were properly lodged, at their present rate of wages, they would be richer. They would be healthier and happier at the same cost. I am so convinced of this, that the moment I am master, I shall build 2,000 cottages on my estates. I have the designs all ready.'

"'I am much in favour of improved dwellings for the poor,' said the Duchess; 'but then you must take care that your dwellings are cottages, and not villas like my cousin's, the Duke of Luton.'

"'I do not think I shall make that mistake,' replied Lothair. 'It constantly engages my thoughts . . . I have lived a great deal alone, dearest Duchess, and thought much of these things; but I feel now I should be hardly equal to the effort, unless I had a happy home to fall back upon.'"

Poor youth! The spooney-pathetic of the last touch is certainly absurd, and is ludicrous; but, perhaps, is not unnatural in an amiable, religiously-disposed, inexperienced young man, even though he were a manly good fellow in all ordinary relations of life. But our point is that, after all this precocity of interest, exhibited by the University lad in the most pressing of social problems, Lothair, in his after-life, and all his company with him, shows no sign of any interest in this or in any other social or political subject of national importance. Such subjects must have presented, so we should have thought, a wide field for interesting suggestion, for frank and vivid discussion, and for satire, of which last form

of D'Israelitish vivacity there is a touch in the Duchess's unmistakable allusion to the Duke of Luton (i.e. Bedford) and his very superior labourers' cottages. It will not be forgotten by those who have read *Pelham*, how that product of Lord Bulwer's early and (almost) youthful authorship, though it is avowedly a novel of fashionable life, and is as much a satire as a picture, has its brilliant frivolity and superfine and supercilious conversations varied and redeemed by clever and earnest discussions on social and political subjects. If young Mr. Bulwer, in the height of his fashionable fooling, could not undertake to describe the career of a clever and foppish young man of society without interspersing passages of earnest discussions, economical and political, it seems strange that a veteran politician like the author of *Lothair*, whose close attention must needs have been given to the most pressing and perplexing problems of modern society and life, should have been able to write a three-volume novel of English society in the present decade of this current century without touching seriously on these problems.

It is amusing to observe what is the only serious project connected with the improvement of modern English society which occupies a place in these volumes. Miss Arundel is the second heroine to whom we are introduced, the second victress to whose goodness and charms Lothair succumbs. Her spell and that of Lady Corisande are rival forces, both of which, in turn, sway the current of Lothair's sympathies and purposes. Miss Arundel, however, is a passionate Roman Catholic, a pervert kinswoman of a noble pervert pair, the Lord and Lady St. Jerome, whereas the Lady Corisande is a zealous English Churchwoman, of decided Protestant principles. Miss Arundel's remedy for social evil [and misery] is characteristic. She thinks and knows nothing of the laws of political economy and social science. "The Church" is the only thing with her, the unchanging sum-total and identity of all remedial powers and agencies. "Had I that command of wealth," she says to Lothair, "of which we hear so much in the present day, and with which the possessors seem to know so little what to do, I would purchase some of those squalid streets in Westminster, which are the shame of the metropolis, and clear a great space, and build a real cathedral, where the worship of Heaven should be perpetually conducted in the full spirit of the ordinances of the Church. I believe, were this done, even this country might be saved." This prescription of Miss Arundel's for the cure of England's sins and sorrows is at once a very

feminine and a very Catholic prescription. The miseries of London and of England are to be healed and ended by sweeping away the present homes of the most squalid and miserable of the population, by thus "clearing a great space," driving the poor dispossessed wretches it matters not whither, and then building a "real cathedral" on the depopulated site. Placed by the side of Lothair's original idea of building 2,000 cottages as his contribution towards "the extinction of pauperism," Miss Arundel's conception looks like an inspiration of blind, and even inhuman, superstition. Nevertheless, it profoundly impresses the imagination of Lothair whilst he remains under the influence of Miss Arundel and her subtle, scheming, persuasive, Catholic friends and confederates of the ecclesiastical vocation; and he resolves to devote to its realisation a round sum of some two hundred thousand pounds, the accumulations of his revenue during his minority. The two thousand cottages might have been built for about the same sum.

Are we, then, to infer, from such an ignoring of social and political science as we have been describing, that, as a class, the landed aristocracy and hereditary legislators of Britain are equally unconcerned and ignorant about all the knowledge and all the principles which should rule the conduct of landed proprietors and direct the legislation of the country? Is this one of the points of the author's satire—the bitterest and cruelest point of all—and directed against the aristocratic party of which he is the political head? At first sight it looks very much like this. Such a view would be confirmed by more than one incidental touch in the volume. Lord St. Aldegonde, the wilful gentlemanly boor, the despiser of all the *convenances* of society, is evidently, notwithstanding his assumption of uncouthness, a favourite character with the author, and is represented as having more brain-power, and more real character, than any other of the men of blue blood who pass before our view. He is represented, besides, as a man of democratic politics, although no political arguments are put into his mouth. On one point, however, this nobleman abandons the principles of democracy. He holds it for an axiom that "a fellow cannot have too much land." Indeed, as the democrats teach that the possession of land should be widely diffused, and is the foundation of civil virtue and loyalty and political stability, his lordship would appear naively, not to say absurdly, to have drawn the conclusion that no citizen could have too much of so good a thing, and thus to have come to regard a great landed aristocracy as one

of the elements of democracy. This reads uncommonly like satire, and is satire no doubt. It well agrees with the description of the English aristocracy which the author puts more than once into the mouth of his artist, Phœbus, as a fine race resembling more than any other the ancient Hellenes, and especially in these three respects, that "they excel in all athletic exercises; speak no language but their own; and never read."

And yet, although there can be no doubt that Mr. D'Israeli does, in this work, keenly satirise aristocratic weaknesses; although he can hardly draw a character without throwing in some dash of satire: although his whole work is fully as much a satire as a romance; yet, we do not believe that, in the particular point of which we have been speaking, he has deliberately intended to satirise the nobility of England. He does not, we are convinced, omit all serious and sensible political and social science and economy from the conversations of his noble company because such subjects do not form matter of discussion in the circles of our most accomplished and distinguished aristocracy. He would not be so cruel to the party which he leads, nor so unjust to the hereditary landowners of England. That too many of these are just such as Mr. Phœbus describes we cannot doubt; that a sadly large proportion spend their lives in the pursuits of mere taste, or, what is worse, mere luxury and pleasure, is beyond a question. But no candid and well-informed man can doubt that not a few of the English nobility are in purpose and character, and in large and solid culture, as well as in wide and graceful accomplishment, eminently worthy of their high position.

The true explanation of the marked deficiency which we have pointed out as pervading Mr. D'Israeli's pictures of modern high life must, as we think, be found in the peculiar position and circumstances in which he is placed as a politician. Mr. D'Israeli, it must not be forgotten, is the leader of a great party. Such a man cannot afford to ventilate ideas and hypotheses in regard to problems of high political moment which he may have to consider and discuss with a view to deliberate Parliamentary action, possibly to practical legislation. The chief of the great Tory party knows full well the significance and importance of the land question for England, in all its ramifications, as affecting dwellings and gardens for the labourer, the graduation of tenancies, if not also of properties, sites for schools, for parks and recreation grounds, and for places of worship, the registration of titles, the law of



primogeniture in cases of intestacy, and the law of entail. These questions are discussed in the best circles of the political and aristocratic society in which he moves. Mr. D'Israeli has, we cannot doubt, his own opinions in respect to them: opinions which, it is more than likely, do not coincide at all points, perhaps not at many points, with the ancient and hereditary creed of the political party which it is his business to lead. The question of Church and State, again, is one, there cannot be a doubt, continually discussed in the circles of which we have been speaking, and as to which Mr. D'Israeli has a special esoteric theory, differing from any that has hitherto been launched on any side, and very imperfectly shadowed forth by his own somewhat impenetrable speeches on the Irish Church Bill of last year. But it is evident that it would be an inconvenient and perilous thing for Mr. D'Israeli to put arguments and opinions on such subjects as we have now indicated into the mouths of any of his characters. These are questions on which he cannot afford to commit himself. Neither directly nor indirectly, neither by the mouth-piece of a character who might be supposed to represent his own party views, nor by one who might afford a pretext for judging him by the rule of contrary, can a politician placed in Mr. D'Israeli's circumstances afford to have it inferrible what his own views may be on the great political questions of the future for England. Mr. D'Israeli's political purposes have always been inscrutable; this has been a part of his power. Accordingly, he has taken care in his present novel to keep off the ground of all party political questions. The question of Roman Catholic designs, of the ambition, the plans, the tactics, of the Papal propagandist party—can hardly be regarded as an exception to the view we have now given. Opposition to Ultramontane fanaticism is not to be considered as a party matter. Neither Tory nor Radical violates any principle of his political or party creed by antagonism to Jesuit policy abroad or to the Ultramontane inspiration and organisation at home, of which Archbishop Manning is supposed to be the head. No doubt this novel is very likely to make Roman Catholics angry. It may not unlikely render it more difficult in the future than in the past for the party of which Mr. D'Israeli is at the head to obtain political support from Roman Catholic Members of Parliament. But this is a matter of minor consequence to the Tories so long as they are out of office. The Protestant cry serves them better whilst in opposition, than a few stray Roman Catholic votes could do. Their only real power is from the root; and the root of the

Tory party is in the soil of old English principles or prejudices. Whichever party is in office finds it necessary to have respect to what is called "the Catholic vote." Out of office, each party relies on broad British sympathy and support. During the last half-dozen years the strength of the Tory party, in some parts of England, has been considerably increased by the bitter antipathy of the English population against the Irish Roman Catholic immigrant population, the Church of England being still, by many, regarded as the natural and organised league of antagonism to the Church of Rome. Accordingly, one of the leading tendencies just now of the Tory party is to appear in its older character, as it was organised during the Georgian era, as the embodiment of Protestant principle against Catholic policy and claims. No doubt, when the Tories return to office, their statesmen will again feel that there is a "Catholic vote" to be considered. But they are not likely to return soon to office, now that their own Reform Bill has come into operation. It is very possible that Mr. D'Israeli may never hold office again. Meantime the party must take new ground, and, in the field of opposition, must be hardily trained for office and power in the future. Apparently, Mr. D'Israeli thinks the Protestant ground is the best position to take up, and wishes his party to fight the coming battle out on that line. If this were so, *Lothair* might be regarded as a by no means unimportant political manifesto. At all events, the most conspicuous and pervasive characteristic of the work is the illustration which it purports to give of the insidious policy and the unscrupulous resolution by which the propagandist plans and tactics of the Roman Catholics in this country are directed. The last character, perhaps, in which Mr. D'Israeli might have been expected to appear is that of Protestant alarmist and anti-Romanist zealot. Nevertheless, in *Lothair* he has composed a "religious romance," of which the inspiration might almost have been derived from the "Reformation Society" or the "National Club." We should hardly be surprised if Mr. Whalley were to quit the latitudinarian ranks which follow the standard of Mr. Gladstone and to join the band who own the leadership of so accomplished and distinguished a Protestant as Mr. D'Israeli.

It was said, when *Lothair* was on the eve of publication, that, like *Coningsby*, it would be found full of portraits, satirically faithful, of living characters of note in the world political or social. In this respect, however, the work has hardly fulfilled expectation; but, in fact, it was really improbable from

the first that Mr. D'Israeli would largely indulge his satirical vein in any such way as was anticipated. It was one thing for him to write himself into fame and power by the brilliant and caustic political and social sketches of living characters which made the fortune of his novel *Coningsby*, as he spoke himself into power in the House by his satirical invectives against the great Conservative leader of his earlier time. It would be quite another thing for one holding his present position of political and social pre-eminence to perpetrate satirical portraits of his distinguished contemporaries, men whom he meets in Parliament and in society as rival powers, or as acquaintances on pleasant and equal terms. As a matter of fact, there is very little of indubitable portraiture in these volumes, and what there is is not likely to produce much inconvenience to the author. The men to whom he has done, as we think, injustice are out of his sphere: to wit, Professor Goldwin Smith, whose excessive folly in publicly answering to and angrily resenting and denouncing the caricature of himself has lowered his position and reputation, both in England and America, far more than Mr. D'Israeli's spiteful satire could ever have done; and Archbishop Manning, whose sentiments and arguments are indeed admirably represented in *Lothair* under the name of Cardinal Grandison, but whose personal character, we can hardly doubt, has been deeply wronged by the imputation to him of such treachery and knavish assurance as the Cardinal is made to practise at Rome in regard to *Lothair*. Where the author of *Lothair* has "done" any persons with whom he is liable to be in personal relations and intercourse, as, for instance, the Bishop of Winchester, under the designation of the Bishop of Grandchester, the sketch is as inoffensive as it is clever. It is said that Dickens was in the habit of setting down in parallel columns in his note-book the quaint names which he met with in his travels and rambles; and then, when he wanted an unprecedented oddity of a designation for any of his characters, he would not unfrequently take the beginning of a name from one of his columns and the end from the other, thus compounding such a name as had never been known before. Now it appears to us that in combining and compounding his characters and his localities the author of *Lothair* has followed some such rule as that which Dickens observed with regard to his names. No one can doubt that in the hero, *Lothair*, several features are combined which were suggested by the history of the Marquis of Bute. The amazing wealth of the two young noblemen, the relations of

each of them to Scotland as well as to England, the strict early Protestant training of both, the grand doings on occasion of the majority of both, the perversion to Rome of one, the all but perversion of the other, in immediate sequence to the celebrations and festivities which had made the three kingdoms resound with the fame of his inestimable wealth and the unparalleled magnificence of his fortunes; these points of coincidence make it evident that the novelist has borrowed leading hints as to the development of his hero's story from the facts of the Marquis's course. At the same time, the personal character, the adventures in detail, and the social relations and companionship of Lothair, are the mere inventions of the author, or at least have nothing to do with any facts in the history of the young Marquis of Bute. The description of Muriel Towers, the seat of Lothair, is borrowed from the princely Alton Towers; but Alton Towers is the seat of the Earls of Shrewsbury, not of the Marquis of Bute. In *Lothair*, the great ducal family which covers so much space on the novelist's canvas owns charming Brentham for a country-seat, one among many belonging to the Duke, and Crecy House is their London mansion. Now, as to the identity of Brentham with Trentham, and of Crecy House with Stafford House, there can be no doubt, and these two noble residences belong to the Duke of Sutherland. It would be a rash and mistaken inference, however, to conclude from this, that the ducal family in *Lothair* is the family of Sutherland. This is certainly not the case. It has been said, indeed, that the family is that of Abercorn, of which all we can say is that the supposition is not evidently impossible. We confess that we do not think it probable, although it may, of course, be true that some features or hints of character have been borrowed by Mr. D'Israeli from the distinguished Tory family which he elevated to the ducal degree, and with which he is so familiar. If the family group of this ducal house were really portraits, the Duke of Abercorn might not unreasonably resent some of the touches. What wicked satire there is, for example, in the following stroke in the artist's picture of the ducal magnate: "Every day when he looked into the glass, and gave the last touch to his consummate toilette, he offered his grateful thanks to Providence that his family was not unworthy of him." We cannot easily persuade ourselves that this trait truly represents the ex-Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Here is one of the instances, by no means few in number, in which the Semitic statesman-satirist makes free to have his caustic jest at the

expense of the decorated order, with which, at bottom, he has so little in common, and amongst whom he moves as a critical foreigner, not unfriendly, but seldom sympathetic.

Vauxe, the country seat of the St. Jerome family, is said to be identified with the beautiful family residence of a baronet of excellent position, distant not a great many miles from London. But the St. Jerome family, with the lovely niece, Miss Arundel, are an invention of the novelist's. His ecclesiastical characters have more portraits among them than any other group. Cardinal Grandison is, unmistakably, Archbishop Manning. We have intimated that his ecclesiastical opinions are very correctly given; his attenuated personal appearance, too, and his social habits, in particular his abstemiousness and his polished and pleasant austerity of personal conduct in society, mingled with bland and politic allowance of the ways of the circle in which he mingles, are carefully, and, we imagine, on the whole, truly sketched; at all events, we can testify that the novelist has well depicted the Archbishop's outer man. Monsignore Catesby, it is equally certain, is intended to represent a well-known Monsignore, a most popular and plausible Roman Catholic preacher and counsellor, whose influence has, of late years, been much felt in English society, whose name begins with the same letter as Catesby, and, oddly enough, was printed in place of Catesby in the earlier editions of the novel. Of the accomplished Catesby, the most refined and dainty ladies, the most saintly devotees, and rollicking young nobles like St. Aldegonde, all and equally speak in terms of high approval. The broad-mannered lord is heartily glad to have the Monsignore with him as one of his smoking conclave, and describes him as a "most capital fellow, who knows everything." Monsignore Berwick is, we believe, intended as a portrait of a distinguished emissary of Rome, subtle, able, polished, and ubiquitous, whose centre is at Rome itself, but who spreads the net of his schemes and weaves his intrigues over half Europe. The Bishop of Grandchester is a portrait which nobody can mistake, and, from first to last, is capitally sketched. Notwithstanding the satirical touches, which give sharpness to the drawing, the whole is done so good-humouredly, and the Bishop himself, if a little too politic and worldly-wise for a successor of the Apostles, is yet presented to us in so pleasant a likeness, that we can hardly imagine him to be offended with the novelist, or that the book will cause any difficulty, or anything worse than an amused mutual self-consciousness, when next the author and himself

meet in society. Take the following sketch of the Bishop at Muriel Towers, on occasion of Lothair's majority, when he was compelled to meet the Cardinal, who, in his unperverted days, had been appointed and left by Lothair's father, one of his executors and of the guardians of his son, and who is therefore present at the Towers on this great occasion, together with his co-executor and guardian, a Presbyterian Scotch earl, whose stern and strict Presbyterian Protestantism has rather helped than hindered the Cardinal's plans for gaining spiritual ascendancy over their common ward :—

"The Bishop had been at college with the Cardinal and intimate with him, though they now met for the first time since his secession—a not uninteresting rencounter. The Bishop was high-church, and would not himself have made a bad cardinal, being polished and plausible, well-lettered, yet quite a man of the world. He was fond of society, and justified his taste in this respect by the flattering belief that by his presence he was extending the power of the Church; certainly favouring an ambition which could not be described as being moderate. The Bishop had no abstract prejudice against gentlemen who wore red hats, and under ordinary circumstances would have welcomed his brother churchman with unaffected cordiality, not to say sympathy; but in the present instance, however gracious his mien and honeyed his expressions, he only looked upon the Cardinal as a dangerous rival, intent upon clutching from his fold the most precious of his flock, and he had long looked to this occasion as the one which might decide the spiritual welfare and career of Lothair. The odds were not to be despised. There were two Monsignores in the room besides the Cardinal, but the Bishop was a man of contrivance and resolution, not easily disheartened or defeated. Nor was he without allies. He did not count much on the University don, who was to arrive on the morrow in the shape of the head of an Oxford house, though he was a don of magnitude. This eminent personage had already let Lothair slip from his influence. But the Bishop had a subtle counsellor in his chaplain, who wore as good a cassock as any Monsignore, and he brought with him also a trusty archdeacon in a purple coat, whose countenance was quite entitled to a place in the *Acta Sanctorum*.

"It was amusing to observe the elaborate courtesy and more than Christian kindness which the rival prelates and their official followers extended to each other. But under all this unction on both sides were unceasing observation, and a vigilance that never flagged; and on both sides there was an uneasy but irresistible conviction that they were on the eve of one of the decisive battles of the social world."

. . . . .

"The Bishop was particularly playful on the morrow at breakfast. Though his face beamed with Christian kindness, there was a twinkle



in his eye which seemed not entirely superior to mundane self-complacency, even to a sense of earthly merriment. His seraphic raillery elicited sympathetic applause from the ladies, especially from the daughters of the house of Brentham, who laughed occasionally even before his angelic jokes were well launched. His lambent flashes sometimes even played over the Cardinal, whose cerulean armour, nevertheless, remained always unscathed. Monsignore Chidioch, however, who would once unnecessarily rush to the aid of his chief, was tumbled over by the Bishop with relentless gaiety, to the infinite delight of Lady Corisande, who only wished it had been that dreadful Monsignore Catesby. But, though less demonstrative, apparently not the least devout, of his Lordship's votaries, were the Lady Flora and the Lady Grizell. These young gentlewomen, though apparently gifted with appetites becoming their ample, but far from graceless, forms, contrived to satisfy all the wants of nature without taking their charmed vision for a moment off the prelate, or losing a word which escaped his consecrated lips.

•   •   •   •   •

" 'I am at your Lordship's service,' said Lothair, and they quitted the breakfast-room together. Half-way down the gallery they met Monsignore Catesby, who had in his hand a number, just arrived, of a newspaper which was esteemed an Ultramontane organ. He bowed as he passed them, with an air of some exultation, and the Bishop and he exchanged significant smiles, which, however, meant different things. Quitting the gallery, Lothair led the way to his private apartments; and, opening the door, ushered in the Bishop.

"Now what was contained in the Ultramontane organ which apparently occasioned so much satisfaction to Monsignore Catesby? A deftly drawn-up announcement of some important arrangements which had been deeply planned. The announcement would be repeated in all the daily papers, which were hourly expected. The world was informed that his Eminence, Cardinal Grandison, now on a visit at Muriel Towers to his ward, Lothair, would celebrate High Mass on the ensuing Sunday in the city which was the episcopal capital of the Bishop's see, and afterwards preach on the present state of the Church of Christ. As the Bishop must be absent from his cathedral that day, and had promised to preach in the chapel at Muriel, there was something dexterous in thus turning his Lordship's flank, and desolating his diocese when he was not present to guard it from the fiery dragon. It was also remarked that there would be an unusual gathering of the Catholic aristocracy for the occasion. The rate of lodgings in the city had risen in consequence. At the end of the paragraph it was distinctly contradicted that Lothair had entered the Catholic Church. Such a statement was declared to be 'premature,' as his guardian the Cardinal would never sanction his taking such a step until he was the master of his own actions; the general impression left by the whole paragraph being, that the world was not to be astonished if the first step of Lothair, on accom-

plishing his majority, was to pursue the very course which was now daintily described as premature.

"There had been a conclave in the Bishop's room before dinner, in which the interview of the morning was discussed.

"'It was successful; scarcely satisfactory,' said the Bishop. 'He is a very clever fellow, and knows a great deal. They have got hold of him, and he has all the arguments at his fingers' ends. When I came to the point he began to demur; I saw what was passing through his mind, and I said at once—'Your views are high: so are mine: so are those of the Church. It is a sacrifice, undoubtedly, in a certain sense. No sound theologian would maintain the simplicity of the elements; but that does not involve the coarse interpretation of the dark ages.'

"'Good, good,' said the Archdeacon; 'and what is it your Lordship did not exactly like?'

"'He fenced too much; and he said more than once, and in a manner I did not like, that, whatever were his views as to the Church, he thought he could, on the whole, conscientiously partake of this rite as administered by the Church of England.'

"'Everything depends on this celebration,' said the Chaplain; 'after that his doubts and difficulties will disperse.'

"'We must do our best that he may be well supported,' said the Archdeacon.

"'No fear of that,' said the Bishop. 'I have spoken to some of our friends. We may depend on the Duchess and her daughters—all admirable women; and they will do what they can with others. It will be a busy day, but I have expressed my hope that the heads of the household may be able to attend. But the county notables arrive to-day, and I shall make it a point with them, especially the Lord-Lieutenant.'

"'It should be known,' said the Chaplain. 'I will send a memorandum to the *Guardian*.'

"'And *John Bull*,' said the Bishop."

The last touch here is perfect; and for those who know the intimate relations which exist between the Bishop, who is "taken" in these sketches, and the *John Bull* newspaper, nothing more could be required to indicate the Bishop intended. It is as much as if the novelist had written the Bishop's style and title under his portrait. Besides the portraits, or half-portraits, which give zest and interest to these volumes, there is a gallery of types of modern thought and feelings, of which we shall presently speak; but there is not much besides. There is no single figure which interests us as a living individuality, created by the author, whom we feel as if we might have known for ourselves. The volumes contain not one original character. Lord St. Aldegonde is but a

sketch, hardly a character,—a clever sketch, no doubt; and it is said that he is more than half a portrait from living society. Mr. Pinto may be similarly described; and, besides, of the real human character of the pleasant, versatile Pinto, we never get a glimpse for a moment. The Duke of Brecon is just a slight etching of the coarse, hard, immoral young nobleman, who has nothing to recommend him but his rank, his fortune, and his cold audacity. Many other names appear and disappear on the glittering stage which Mr. D'Israeli has filled and garnished; but we see only their outsides, their persons and manners, and glimpses of their life in society or business. Perhaps Mr. Putney Giles, the admirable lawyer and man of business—prosperous, faithful, and generous—and his clever, ambitious, pushing, yet estimable and well-behaved wife, are the best drawn and most genuine characters in the book. Of this pair, however, in their intimate selves, and their personal realities and histories, we know nothing. They are altogether secondary and dependent; whence they come and whither they go we know not. The leading characters seem to be either portraits or types of a class,—often very ideal types. We have the Bishop, the Cardinal, the Monsignores, the model young English Church-woman, equally tractable and zealous; the passionate pervert and devotee to Rome. We have the young English lord, sensible, modest, with some tincture of scholarly knowledge and general study derived from Oxford, but yet only half educated, and, on the whole, wretchedly ill-informed, endowed with wealth and estates which he knows not how rightly to use or administer, solicited by doubts and controversies which he is altogether unprepared to resolve, exposed to the influences of Oxford High Churchmanship, and to the subtle inferences and consequences pressed upon him by the emissaries of Rome. We have the general crowd of fashionable lords, ladies, and diners-out. These figures belong to modern society; they are sketched with much vivacity of conception and brilliancy of phrase; they give an impression, so far, of reality; they are of the English world, worldly and actual; they furnish the materials of good animated description and conversation, and of smart satire. They constitute the element of satirical realism in the strange composite which Mr. D'Israeli has called *Lothair*. The other element is altogether romantic and ideal; and the interlacing of the two into one story is the greatest peculiarity of this strange book. May-fair and fairy-land are wrought into one composition; the *tableaux* of a London season and of the *Arabian Nights* are

commingled. We do not now refer to the *fêtes* at Muriel Towers, in which the vivacious author has given the loosest rein to his Oriental faculty of romantic and gorgeous invention; we refer to the ideal types whom Mr. D'Israeli introduces as living characters into his story.

There is the "divine Theodora," in its way a noble conception, and splendidly painted. But it is certain that such a woman never lived, and never will live. She is a Mazzinian; nationality is her creed; the progress of the race her faith. A Roman by birth, of the most superb and noble beauty, Rome and the Roman Republic are all she lives for. She is deeply religious, she believes in God and in prayer, but Christianity is no element in her religion or her faith. In her Republicanism is idealised and elevated into a pure inspiration, wide as the race. In her religion appears in its most generic form,—grand, charitable, noble in its humanities,—but utterly vague and shapeless. By the Republican secret societies throughout Europe she is looked upon almost as a goddess; and that revolt from the ideas of a degraded and idolatrous Catholicism, as expressed equally in Church and in State, which has been identified with the name of Mazzini, is, in Theodora, impersonated in a form which the author has lavished all his powers in making as lofty and as attractive as possible.

A slight etching of Mazzini himself, under the name of Mirandola, is sketched into the story:—

"There came forward to meet him (Captain Bruges, the mysterious 'General') a man rather below the middle height, but of a symmetrical and imposing mien. His face was grave, not to say sad; thought, not time, had partially silvered the clustering of his raven hair; but intellectual power reigned in his wide brow, while determination was the character of the rest of his countenance, under great control, yet apparently, from the dark flashing of his eye, not incompatible with fanaticism."

The whole of the chapter from which we quote this passage is devoted to Mazzini in his London lodgings, and a description of his interview with "the General," *alias* Captain Bruges, who is one of the most important secondary personages in the book—a military leader inferior in experience, influence, and ability among Italian patriots only to Garibaldi himself—who, like Garibaldi, has served in Transatlantic warfare—who is the military go-between of Mazzini and Garibaldi, and is a great name and spell among all the secret societies—who is represented as the most active leader in the Italian risings of the autumn of 1867, as having organised the bands which then threatened Rome, and as having gained the most

important of those victories which, but for the interposition of the French and the battle of Mentana, would, without the personal presence and lead of Garibaldi, have brought the Papal dominion in Rome to an end—and who, finally, is represented as having, in default of any further actual service to be rendered in Italy, entered the Turkish service and been invested with high command. Whether this Italian patriot, this mysterious General, is altogether an invention of the author's, is more than we can guess. Theodora and he are in close league; Theodora's husband, Colonel Campian—a Southern American, of the United States—is one of his officers. Under the paramount influence of Theodora—whose sway over the affections and character of the impressible young nobleman quite carries him off, from the time of their first introduction to each other, and so long as she lives, from the fascinations of the rival stars, Lady Corisande and Miss Arundel—Lothair takes service under the General in Italy, and devotes his two hundred thousand pounds neither to cottage nor cathedral building, but to the enterprise of delivering Rome; and, finally, Lothair meets the General in Palestine, where he himself was learning tranquillity and wisdom in travel, and where the General comes across him at the head of Turkish troops.

One of the ideal characters in these volumes is the artist, Mr. Phœbus. He represents the sensuous art and life theories of our modern society; take from the doctrines of Rossetti all that is passionately sensual, and the remainder might represent the epicureanism of Mr. Phœbus. In painting this character, his Greek wife and her sister, his taste, his splendour, his life and fortunes, the brilliant luxury of his *ménage* at his metropolitan home, the superb play and display of his yachting life, his doings when he visits the isles of Greece, his wealth of genius, his boundless prodigality of expenditure, the magnificent Orientalism of his tastes and his ostentation, his cultured Paganism of philosophy and of polytheising nature-worship, Mr. D'Israeli has fooled it to the top of his bent. No Eastern dream could be wilder than his sketch of the great artist Mr. Phœbus, with his theories about Aryans, Hellenes, the Semitic race; with his religions of nature, his wisdom of impulse, his human perfectibility by mere physical culture and influences. It is this artist who gives once and again that description of the non-reading, mere English-speaking, insular aristocracy of Britain, which we have already quoted, and the smartness of which will not allow it to be soon forgotten. Mr. Phœbus we regard as a

merely typical and ideal character. He represents what an art-theorist of the modern school might do, and might be, if he had wealth at command, and if, with a sort of power of enchantment, he could give effect and reality to all his desires and dreams. The whole group of which Mr. Phœbus is the centre, and all the scenery amid which the group move, is a work of mere romance: the romance, not of "real life," or of modern society, but of art-dreams and of sensuous display and perfection. The two sisters of miraculous grace, taste, and beauty, nymphs of joy and radiance, of whom the artist's wife is one, are mere visions of poetry. They are represented as the daughters of a Greek merchant, of high culture, enormous wealth, and most pure and princely ancient Hellenic blood. And the unmarried sister is made to wed Lothair's most intimate friend, the brother of Lady Corisande, the heir of the ducal house of Brentham.

Perhaps, however, the most remarkable and significant of the ideal characters in *Lothair* is the Syrian, who is named Paraclete. Lothair has found in the society and influence of Theodora an antidote against the bewitching spells of Miss Arundel, Monsignore Catesby, Cardinal Grandison, and the rest. He has seen Theodora die of a wound received in the battle of Viterbo, and, with her last breath, has received the injunction never to yield to the ensnarements of Rome. He has himself been dangerously wounded in battle; has been carried wounded into Rome, and there has been slowly restored to consciousness and brought to convalescence by the tender nursing and attentions of Miss Arundel and the St. Jerome family, who were on a visit at Rome; has thus again, under circumstances of special pressure, been brought within the power of the fair devotee and her ecclesiastical friends; has been disgracefully trepanned into taking part in a public religious ceremony at Rome, and been published to the world as a convert to the Catholic faith, a transaction in which Cardinal Grandison is represented as taking a part equally cunning, audacious, and unprincipled; has contrived to make his escape from the surveillance of the ecclesiastical agents and managers who kept watch about him, and to find his way to Malta; there has, to his great relief, fallen in with the artist and his sisters yachting for the autumn; has accompanied them to the Greek islands, and thence to Syria and Palestine, where he falls in with Bertram (heir of the dukedom), Lord St. Aldegonde, as also (in passing) with the "General;" and here in Palestine, also, he is introduced to Paraclete. He has been brought successively under the



influence of Oxford training, of English Church-womanship, of Anglo-Roman Catholic devotion under its fairest guise, of Mazzinian nationalism, of sensuous art-culture and nature-worship; he has had opened to his view the great continental struggle which is going on between the Western Mother-Church, the Papal Catholicism, and the secret societies which undermine and honeycomb the roots of general society and political activity on the continent of Europe, and of which this book *Lothair* speaks so largely and with so much emphasis (perhaps not too largely or with too much emphasis); and now, after so wide and searching an experience, the perplexed wanderer longs for rest, but knows not where to find it. It is at this juncture that he meets with Paraclete. He is spoken of as a Syrian, who might have sat for the picture of St. John, with "a face of Paradise," and "a voice commanding from its deep sweetness."

" 'My home,' he said to Lothair, 'is in the north of Palestine, on the other side of Jordan, beyond the Sea of Galilee. My family has dwelt there from time immemorial, but they always loved this city, and have a legend that they dwelled occasionally within its walls even in the days when Titus from that hill looked down upon the Temple. Our family were among the first followers of Jesus, and we then held lands in Bashan which we hold now. We had a gospel once in our district where there was some allusion to this, and being written by neighbours, and probably at the time, I dare say it was accurate; but the Western Churches declared our gospel was not authentic, though why I cannot tell, and they succeeded in extirpating it. It was not an additional reason why I should enter their fold; so I am content to dwell in Galilee, and trace the footsteps of my Divine Master, musing over His life and pregnant sayings amid the mounts He sanctified and the waters He loved so well.' "

He thus takes farewell of Lothair :—

" 'Peace be with you!' said the Syrian. 'I live without the gate of Damascus, on a hill which you will easily recognise, and my name is Paraclete.' "

Here, it appears to us, is the glimpse of a parable. The Paraclete is a holy name. This Paraclete is no other than the Interpreter of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. His face is "a face of Paradise," and wears upon it the likeness of him who wrote the Gospel of the Comforter, "the Paraclete." His Church is one more ancient than that of East or of West; he teaches a Christian unity higher and more ancient than that of mere Catholicism (so called), whether Roman or Anglican. By such views as these he enlightens, comforts, and settles the

mind and heart of the perturbed and perplexed Englishman. This aspect of Mr. D'Israeli's book may be regarded as fantastic by many; but we confess that we welcome and like it.

Paraclete disposes of Mr. Phœbus and his theories briefly—

"Physical beauty is his standard of excellence, and he has a fanciful theory that moral order would be the consequence of the worship of physical beauty, for without moral order he holds physical beauty cannot be maintained. But the answer to Mr. Phœbus is, that his system has been tried and has failed, under conditions more favourable than are likely to exist again: the worship of nature ended in the degeneration of the human race."

He thus discriminates very truly and happily between the naturism of the artist and Pantheism, whilst he gives Pantheism its true definition and character in a sentence:—

"I should not describe him as a Pantheist, whose creed requires more abstraction than the worshipper of nature would tolerate. His school never care to pursue any investigation which cannot be followed by the eye—and the worship of the beautified always ends in an orgy. As for Pantheism, it is Atheism in domino. The belief in a Creator, who is unconscious of creating, is more monstrous than any dogma of any of the Churches. . . As for the natural forces to which all creation is now attributed, we know they are unconscious, while consciousness is as inevitable a portion of our existence as the eye or the hand. The conscious cannot be derived from the unconscious."

Lothair had heard much of councils, as having sole authority to settle dogmas. Thus Paraclete deals with councils:—

"'God made man in His own image is the charter of the nobility of man, one of the Divine dogmas revealed in this land; not the invention of councils, not one of which was held on this sacred soil, confused assemblies first got together by the Greeks, and then by barbarous nations in barbarous times. As for Churches depending on councils, the first council was held more than three centuries after the Sermon on the Mount. We Syrians had churches in the interval; no one can deny that. I bow before the Divine decree that swept them away from Antioch to Jerusalem; but I am not yet prepared to transfer my spiritual allegiance to Italian Popes and Greek Patriarchs.'"

Lothair, under the teaching of Paraclete, is settled on the orthodox basis of broad Christianity, superior to minute points of calculation and learning about councils, creeds, and Episcopal successions. He returns to England a man of firm character and fixed convictions. Miss Arundel loses all hope of making a convert of him, and takes the veil. He marries Lady Corisande.

What we have written gives of necessity a very imperfect idea of the remarkable book we have been reviewing. Only sinister prejudice can deny that it abounds in graceful sketches, in brilliant description, in vigorous and versatile writing. As a work of art it has many faults, because there is a radical incompatibility between the elements which enter into the composition of the book. It is partly a novel of society and of religious parties, edged with irrepressible satire, and inlaid with pictures of Jesuit propagandism; partly a wild and wondrous vision of romance, and partly a parable of modern experience, showing the way of escape out of religious controversies and Paganish theories of philosophy and art on to the firm ground of Christian truth and faith. It is, therefore, a medley, and defies all the harmonies and metres. But it is an interesting, and even an instructive book. We lay it down, marvelling at the want of symmetry in Mr. D'Israeli's richly-gifted and furnished intellect; marvelling still more how so strange, undisciplined, incomplete, a man of genius, steeped in gorgeous Orientalism of taste and fancy, and revelling at sixty-five in the wildest day-dreams, could ever have plodded through Treasury accounts and expounded budgets as Chancellor of the Exchequer; could have maintained his position for thirty years as one of the ablest debaters in the House of Commons; could have succeeded the turfite, Lord George Bentinck, in the lead of the Tory party in the House of Commons; could have attained to the position which he now holds at the head of the Tory party. If there is one thing which this book proves more than another, it is that its author is the antithesis of all that might have been prescribed as necessary in a statesman who has held his place during the last twenty years. He is cosmopolitan, not insular; a man of ideas, not of expedients; was once a scrivener, but never at the University or the Bar; he is as little of an Anglo-Catholic as he is of a Roman Catholic, and of a Puritan as of either the one or the other; he is destitute of the prejudices, the sympathies, and the training which might have been regarded as indispensable for the position he has held, and yet he has reached that position against all difficulties, and has maintained it ably and well. *Lothair* is not a work of art; but it is highly illustrative of modern life, and, above all, it is illustrative of the character of the author. If any of D'Israeli's novels should long survive, it will be those which, like *Coningsby* and *Lothair*, cast light upon the character of the Tory prime minister of the present age, and on the political and social life in which he

has moved about with so keen and critical an eye ; and this in particular may teach how the Hebrew premier of Queen Victoria has attained to a position of large and firm Christian faith, more serene and more stable than that which, as yet, has been gained by his greater and more profoundly religious rival. Mr. Gladstone's early bent towards the highest form of Anglicanism has operated as a barrier to the just development of his religious convictions. Mr. D'Israeli seems to share Mr. Gladstone's views as to the respective shares which the Hebrew and the Hellenic races have had in the total development of the race, religiously and intellectually ; but he has not had to struggle with the same entanglements, in order to escape from the narrow and ritualistic opinions which have been taught at Oxford to earnest and religious spirits.

---

ART. IX.—*Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament.* By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Longmans, Green & Co. 1870.

THERE are, perhaps, few of our readers who were not startled on looking at their morning paper on the 11th of February last. Their surprise was not occasioned by some unexpected political movement, or by news of unforeseen events abroad: neither Parliament, nor Law Courts, nor 'Change furnished the topic which excited at once astonishment and deep interest. The columns which drew the reader's eye were those recording a debate in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. The proceedings of Convocation appeal, usually, to a limited circle. The real power possessed by the body is so small, and the range of discussion has frequently been so narrow, that many even of those who are attached members of the Established Church are satisfied with a hasty glance at the names of the speakers, the topics canvassed, and the general results of debate. Exceptional in every respect was the record of which we speak. No notice, as far as we know, had been given that a subject of special interest was about to be brought forward. There had been no letters to the *Times* indicating that this subject was now occupying public attention, and supplying that impulse from without which great bodies usually require to induce them to move. Hence, we say, it was with something like amazement that most readers learned on this morning that the Upper House of Convocation had, on the day preceding, been occupied with the consideration of a motion, brought forward by the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester, on the propriety of revising the Authorised Version of the Bible. Nay, more: not only was this daring project mooted, but it found almost universal favour with the prelates of the Upper House. The terms of the original motion referred to the New Testament only; by the unanimous voice of the Bishops present they were enlarged, and made to comprehend the whole Bible. The Committee of Inquiry for which the Bishop of Winchester had asked was at once appointed. Nor was the Lower House behindhand in expressing approval of the work, or, at all

events, of the inquiry. Without discussion, on the motion of Canon Selwyn, fourteen members of the Lower House were joined to the seven prelates appointed by the Upper. The Committee thus constituted was instructed "to report upon the desirableness of a Revision of the Authorised Version of the Old and New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek Text originally adopted by the Translators, or in the Translations made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist."

The effect produced by the news was worthy of the importance of the question which had been raised. Whilst on some the intelligence fell like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky, others thankfully hailed the fulfilment of their earnest hopes after many years of waiting and discouragement. On the whole, we think, the action of Convocation has received decided approval from the public press. In some quarters the opposition has been strong and strenuous,—we had almost said furious. Lord Shaftesbury hastened to place himself at the head of those who opposed all change in a version so dear to the heart of the nation. In a second letter to the *Times*, written to remove the impression that in his declaration of hostility he had spoken not for himself alone, but also for the Bible Society, of which he is President, he boldly declares that he has no intention of being either neutral or silent. Many have followed on the same side. On the other hand, the propriety of the step taken by Convocation has been eagerly asserted by writers in some of the daily papers, and in organs of the Church of England and of various Dissenting bodies. To many Nonconformists, however, the movement is acceptable rather as a step in the right direction than as satisfactory in itself; it being held that the desired result can only be obtained by the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Amidst this diversity of opinion, most will agree to honour the courage and fidelity of those eminent men who, impelled by a strong sense of duty, have urged on the English Church the great work of revising the translation of the Scriptures. We have heard much of the timidity of Bishops. They have again and again been accused of preferring a temporising policy, when the times called for earnest and courageous action. It is very possible that the charge is well founded, and that the rulers of the English Church might have gained for that Church a firmer hold on the people of this land, had they less often yielded to the difficulties (confessedly great)



which embarrass their position. Be that as it may, there has been no temporising in this case. With a full knowledge of the opposition to be encountered, the odium to be endured, the extreme difficulties with which every step is surrounded, many of the Bishops of the Church of England, and indeed the whole Convocation of the Southern Province, have obeyed without hesitation what they held to be the call of duty, leaving results in the hand of God. Whatever our own opinions may be, we must do justice to such single-minded courage.

This is not the first time that Convocation has been urged to undertake the work of providing a revised translation of the Scriptures. Professor Selwyn, in moving the appointment of the Committee, in February last,

"Asked leave to withdraw the notice of motion which was first made by himself on the 1st of February, 1856, as it was now superseded by the proposal of the Upper House. The object of the notice which he had given fourteen years ago was to ask the President and the Upper House to take into their consideration the appointment of a joint committee of both Houses to collect and bring under consideration the proposed amendments and suggestions of the last two and a half centuries, with a view to the further improvement of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scripture. His motion had been put off from time to time, but he had invariably renewed it at the beginning of each year."—See the *Guardian*, Feb. 16, p. 198.

In the excellent and useful work the title of which stands at the head of this article, the Bishop of Gloucester gives an interesting account of the proceedings in Convocation to which Professor Selwyn refers. Unless the Professor is misreported in the passage quoted above, he has, through some lapse of memory, substituted for his original motion another, which he brought forward in its stead in February 1857. The former proposal contemplated the appointment of a Royal Commission, which should consider proposed amendments of the Authorised Version, communicate with foreign scholars on difficult passages, examine marginal readings introduced since 1611, point out words and phrases which have changed their meaning or become obsolete, and report from time to time on the progress of their work. In July 1856, Mr. Heywood moved in the House of Commons an address to the Crown for the same object, but without success. Nor were the advocates of change more successful in the following session of Convocation. The subject, which had been very fully discussed in reviews and other publications during the

two preceding years, seems now to have dropped. But the discussion was not without important results. In the preface to his Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, published in 1856, Bishop Ellicott, in words which have been very frequently quoted, and which have exerted a wide-spread influence, passes under review the state of feeling with regard to this question. Pointing out that there were three parties,—one desiring a new version, another advocating a revision of the existing version, a third opposing all change,—he utters a strong protest against the principles of the first and last. He expresses boldly his conviction that the errors in the Authorised Version are neither insignificant nor imaginary; and that the removal of the “misrepresentations of the mind of the Holy Ghost” is a sacred duty. At the same time, he deprecates any immediate authoritative revision; and advocates, as the best and wisest course, that small bands of scholars should make independent efforts on separate books, courting impartial criticism, learning wisdom by their failures, and hoping “by their partial successes to win over the prejudiced and the gainsaying.” We do not know to what extent this invitation was responded to. One band, however, had been already formed, and was, as we now learn, actually at work at the time of which we speak. The “Five Clergymen” thus associated were Drs. Barrow and Moberly, and Messrs. Alford, Humphrey and Ellicott. The first fruit of their labours appeared in 1857, in a revised version of St. John’s Gospel. In this and the succeeding portions of their work, the Authorised Version and the Revised Version were given in parallel columns, to facilitate comparison and invite criticism. The preface to the Revised Translation of St. John, which serves as a general preface to the whole series, is from the pen of Dr. Moberly. It contains a very interesting account of the principles of the translation and the object of the work. In the following year were published the Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians, on a similar plan; and in 1861, the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, by four clergymen out of the five. It must not be supposed that those who undertook this labour imagined that they were doing more than preparatory work. They are content if they “have at all succeeded in striking the key-note upon which any authorised revision of the English Bible, hereafter to be made, is to be based.” We shall have occasion afterwards to speak of the principles on which this revision was executed. We are now referring to it in its historical connection with the development of public opinion

on the general question. From this point of view, the attempt has proved a real success. Some who agreed with its authors that the time for authoritative action had not yet come, acknowledged the merit of this revision. Archbishop Trench speaks of the five clergymen as having "not merely urged by precept, but shown by proof, that it is possible to revise our Version, and at the same time to preserve unimpaired the character of the English in which it is composed." He accepts the work as "by far the most hopeful contribution which we have yet had to the solution of a great and difficult problem;" and adds, that the work "deserves the most grateful recognition of the Church."\* Mr. Marsh, in his *Lectures on the English Language*, whilst criticising some points of detail, speaks of the revision of the Gospel of St. John (the only part which had at that time been published) as "by far the most judicious modern recension known to him." There were voices of another kind, it is true. Some who desired more sweeping changes spoke of this revision as "leading to a non-result," "the seed of an homer yielding no more than an ephah;" but we believe that the very circumstance lamented by such critics was a cause of devout thankfulness to many, who learned for the first time that the improvements which scholars of the foremost rank desired to make in our English Scriptures left their character unchanged, their excellencies unimpaired. But it is not for this reason only that we notice this particular work. It constitutes a link between the former period of discussion and the present. Those who were engaged in this earlier effort, who learned in the school of practical experience that moderate revision was possible, and also on what principles it must be executed in order to lead to a successful result, now occupy positions of high influence in their Church, and have used their influence to promote the cause they have at heart.

We cannot profess to trace in detail the history of the time which intervened between these two periods, though without some such examination the cause of the change of opinion which has taken place cannot be fully understood. Both in the Church of England and amongst Dissenters valuable works have appeared, diffusing amongst students of the sacred Word sounder and more accurate information than was formerly accessible. The reader who wishes to follow the history more closely, may be referred to Professor Plumptre's excellent article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (Vol. III. pp. 1679 sq.).

---

\* On the Authorised Version of the New Testament, p- 55.

Dean Alford's persistent endeavours have made many leading facts familiar to a very large circle; and his revision of the whole New Testament, on the principles already worked out by himself and his coadjutors for certain portions, is a valuable contribution to sacred learning. At the same time, Biblical studies have been generally advancing: there has been a considerable increase in the number of students, and in the thoroughness of critical inquiry. There is, moreover, a greater willingness than formerly to look proposed changes in the face to examine their real character, instead of shrinking from them at once simply because they are changes. Enemies have arisen in the field, of such magnitude that a common danger has stilled many minor strifes. Men feel that it is idle to cling to form when the substance is at stake. In the presence of those who deny the truths themselves, it is of the highest importance that these truths should be presented with all possible clearness.

These are some of the causes which explain the difference between the reception given by Convocation (and, we believe, by the majority of the general public) to the project of 1856 and that of 1870. One circumstance, indeed, warns us against a hasty judgment as to the general feeling in the Church of England on the subject. The Northern Province has refused its co-operation. Though nothing could be more moderate than the proposal for a joint committee of investigation, the Convocation of York has decided to stand aloof, on the ground that the time is inexpedient, and that the dangers are greater than the gains. We shall notice these objections hereafter. We will simply express our regret that the prelates and clergy of the Northern Province should not have seen that it is sometimes the truest conservatism to be wisely liberal; and that it is more prudent to seek to guide a movement that cannot be stayed, than to stand aloof or oppose. There is reason to hope, however, that the hasty decision will be retracted, and that the two provinces will yet be united in the sacred work.

It would be premature to say much of what has been done by the Committee of Convocation during the last few months. At some future time, when we have definite results before us, we may return to the subject, and examine in detail the progress made. Meanwhile, we merely enumerate a few facts—facts already familiar to most of our readers. The Committee having reported in favour of entering immediately on the work of revision, eight members of each House were chosen for this purpose; power being given them "to invite the

co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they might belong." This power was speedily used, and before the end of May invitations were issued to some thirty-seven gentlemen, of whom about seventeen were unconnected with the Church of England. Thus constituted, the two Committees, charged respectively with the translation of the Old and New Testaments, entered upon their labours before the end of June.

We must now leave historical detail for the sake of considering the question of Revision in its generality. In one respect, indeed, we shall narrow the field of inquiry, confining our attention to the New Testament, as it is the subject of the volume which we are desirous of introducing to the readers of this Review. The two questions which present themselves to the mind are these:—Are the imperfections of our present version sufficient to make it desirable that we should attempt to correct them? Is there any likelihood of our succeeding in such an attempt without losing more than we should gain? The rules of orderly procedure might seem to require that these questions should be considered first, and that the argument should be followed by an examination of objections. In point of fact, however, these objections meet us first. They are directed against all consideration of the subject before us. Till they are set aside, we have no clear field on which the arguments *pro* and *con.* can be set forth. At the risk, then, of reversing a natural order, and even of handling the same topic more than once in the course of this inquiry, we will, before proceeding farther, notice some of these objections.

Nothing is farther from our wish than to bear hardly on objectors. Had more sympathy been shown them, their ranks would be thinner: an argument may simply repel, when it might have been made to convince. Nothing is more natural—few things are in themselves, perhaps, more gratifying—than the conservatism which has been displayed in reference to this subject. The letters which have appeared in the public journals respecting it have been most heterogeneous in their character, exciting sometimes admiration, sometimes a feeling very near contempt, sometimes real pain and grief in the mind of a careful reader. Some who wrote with dogmatic assumption on one side or the other, showed by flagrant misstatements how little they understood the subject on which they presumed to speak. But amidst much diversity, it was most pleasing to trace the agreement of almost all the disputants in hearty affection for our present

version. It is in this graceful form, this beautiful dress, that the Bible has been the cherished guest of our forefathers, the dear companion of our own lives. We have grown familiar with every feature, with every adornment, of the friend so dear to our hearts; and who is there who will severely blame the man who clings to the graces he has known and loved so well, even if the attachment to form and dress be greater than reason can fully approve? The proposals for change have been made by *scholars*: and, alas! the world has heard so much of the crude fancies of those who have borne this name; has so often had proof that the title may be assumed without any rightful claim; has been reminded so many times of the disagreements between learned men; has had so much excuse for believing that a scholar is like the alchemists of old, willing to sacrifice all that common men hold precious and desirable for the sake of a secret which exists nowhere but in the fancy of the enthusiast himself; that we cannot wonder that with many the first impulse is one of distrust. Unfortunately for their cause, certain learned advocates of change have enabled the world to judge of something more than their theory. It was sarcastically said of Archbishop Newcome, that the rules which he laid down for translating the Scriptures were so excellent, that no one could have doubted his fitness for executing the work had he never published translations. If a translator of the last century could, in all soberness, propose to change "Much learning doth make thee mad," into "Your profound erudition hath disordered your intellects," or render James i. 8 by "A man of this duplicity and irresolution is, throughout the whole of his actions, perpetually the sport of caprice and inconsistency;" if a man of Dr. George Campbell's learning and keen sense could write "voucheth the veracity of God" for "hath set to his seal that God is true;" or if a more recent translator could render James i. 2 by "Keep yourselves perfectly cheerful when you are exposed to a variety of trials;" there is some excuse for the prejudice which refuses to hear of "improved translations," for the steady indifference which says that "the old is better."

Foremost amongst objections stands admiration of our Authorised Version, unwillingness to touch so noble a work. Happily we here stand on common ground. There are very few who will not join in the chorus of praise. Todd, in his *Vindication* of our Authorised Version, gives a *catena* of praises bestowed upon it by learned men, quoting Selden, Walton, Pocock, Swift, Lowth, Durell, Geddes, Middleton,



and others; and his list would be largely extended if brought down to our own time. One encomium we shall venture to transcribe, often as portions of it have been quoted. It has frequently been ascribed to Dr. Newman, but is really from the pen of Father Faber, and will be found in his *Essay on the Interest and Characteristics of the Lives of the Saints* :—

“Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things, rather than mere words. It is a part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. Nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry, in extenuation of whose grotesque fanaticism its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the man of letters and the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments; and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. It has been to him all along as the silent, but O how intelligible voice of his guardian angel; and in the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant, with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible.”

Few hearts will refuse sympathy to many of these beautiful words. But we must not forget that some of the highest and most intelligent commendations that the Authorised Version has received have come from those who have advocated its improvement. We forbear to cite illustrations, though they are to our hand. Beauty of language, tender associations, must not stand first in our thoughts. Truth is more beautiful than rhythm. A multitude of witnesses may bear testimony to the old, and deprecate the new; but it is possible to “follow a multitude to do evil.” It may be true, as Lord Shaftesbury says, that, “were the Bible-reading people polled at this moment, man by man, woman by woman, child by child, the overwhelming majority would announce that they stood firm to the inheritance of their forefathers, and that, here at least, they would never exchange ‘old lamps for new.’” \* But apart from the proof of love for the Word of God itself, of what value would such an announcement be? Are we to suppose

---

\* See *The Times*, March 7th.

the "Bible-reading people" to give their votes in the absence of all instruction in the merits of the case? If not, we are brought to the question which underlies all others, whether there exists imperfection which will justify change. If such imperfection does exist, and can be amended, we trust there are but few amongst us who would refuse to exchange the "old lamps," which obscure God's light, for "new," which permit its full radiance to stream forth. What we have received from our fathers is the jewel of God's Word; and our admiration for the setting must not prevent us from availing ourselves of any means by which the beauties of the jewel may be more clearly displayed.

"But the imperfections are very few." That remains to be proved. And if few, why not remove them? "They do not touch any article of faith, or affect the Christian life." This is, perhaps, the favourite argument; and shallow indeed it is. Is the Bible, then, nothing but a storehouse of dogma? Must we consider nothing in a verse beyond its bearing on systematic theology? Let us see where this principle will land us. We are accustomed to assume that the Apostles wrote in order to convince; the closest students of St. Paul have admired most warmly the cogency of his reasoning. But surely it must be a mistake to talk of anything of the kind to an English reader. Scholars may have the privilege of tracing the noble argument, feeling and bowing before the power of inspiration, as they ponder on the words of a wisdom higher than that of earth. The unlettered must stand aside. A faulty reading, a mistaken tense, a mistranslated particle, the unauthorised addition or omission of a word, may make all the difference between clear and consecutive sense and a halting and feeble argument. (Let the student of Euclid try what will be the effect of changing *and* into *therefore*, or *but* into *for*.) Yet no article of faith hangs in the balance; and we are told no syllable must be changed! Are we prepared to give up the practice of preaching and hearing sermons founded on texts of Scripture? Yet this practice supposes correctness of translation, and not merely soundness of doctrine. Bishop Ellicott truly says (p. 190):—

"It is no use saying that the corrections needed will not affect great principles, or that no errors have been produced, as a speaker at York expressed it, 'inconsistent with the truth of God.' There *are* errors in our translation which involve such inconsistency, and involve it too in the way in which vital truths are most seriously affected—viz. by the *inferences* drawn from the written words. Suppose it be true, though even this we do not concede, that there is no obvious error in our Version,

whether in the text or in the translation, affecting any distinct definition of doctrine, yet can anyone, with the most moderate knowledge of theology, undertake to deny that a great number of current deductions, commonly made and commonly accepted, affecting such vital doctrines as the doctrine of personal salvation, and the doctrine of the Last things—what is technically called soteriology and eschatology—rest upon mis-translations of words, and misconceptions in exegesis, which might be greatly reduced, if not wholly removed, by a fair and scholarly revision?"

But "the language is that of English theology; and to alter the language is to remove the connection between the Bible and the best uninspired expositions of Bible doctrine." There is truth in this; but, on the other hand, how often have our best divines found it necessary to desert the Authorised Version, in order to set forth with greater truth and clearness the relations of revealed truth. Surely, in our present circumstances this danger is most remote. Nothing would tax our credulity more than to believe that such a body of scholars as that in whose hands revision now rests could forget the connection between the language of theology and that of our version, or dream of effacing the tokens of this affinity by aiming at novelty in theological terms. We have recently heard much of another objection, founded on the fact that the present Authorised Version is common to almost all sects and parties. It is urged that revision would "loosen the bond" between the Church of England and Nonconformists at home, and between the Churches of England and America. In his excellent work on the Authorised Version, Archbishop Trench (writing in 1859) expresses his serious fears on this head (p. 207):—

"Even if English Dissenters acknowledged the necessity of a revision, which I conclude from many indications that they do, it is idle to expect that they would accept such at our hands. Two things then might happen. Either they would adhere to the old Authorised Version, which is not indeed very probable; or they would carry out a revision, it might be two or three, of their own. In either case the ground of a common Scripture, of an English Bible which they and we hold equally sacred, would be taken from us; the separation and division, which are now the sorrow and perplexity and shame of England, would become more marked, more deeply fixed than ever."

The Bishop of Gloucester acknowledges this to be "one of those real objections which no one can afford lightly to pass by," but comes to a very hopeful conclusion. He points to the willingness which Nonconformists (acting, of course, as private persons) have shown to co-operate with Churchmen,

add to the cordial invitation which Convocation has given to Dissenting scholars to join in the work. He quotes an apposite illustration from the Bible Society's report of the successful execution of the Tamil version of the Scriptures. During nine or ten years, ministers connected with the various Missionary bodies in the Tamil-speaking district laboured together in revising the Tamil Bible. At the close, the revisers speak thankfully of "the unbroken harmony which prevailed from first to last. . . . There has never been the slightest jarring or discordance of feeling among us during our long conferences. . . . So rapidly did the time always fly by, that we ended each day's work with reluctance; and the only day that hung heavily on our spirits was the last, when we felt that our work had come to an end, and that all that remained for us to do was to prepare to part." One example is worth many theories in such a case as this. No Nonconformist could fear that his co-religionists would be unwilling to unite with the Church of England for any purpose which they jointly held to be of great importance. The difficulty has certainly been on the other side. In the good providence of God the feeling of exclusiveness is passing away, and along with it the difficulties, great and small, to which it gave birth. Let there be no fears, then, lest there should be a "Church Bible and a Dissenters' Bible." As the writer of a leading article in the *Times* remarks: "If a revision be well performed, we cannot entertain any doubt that its excellence will be as fully appreciated by influential Nonconformists as by Churchmen." Bishop Ellicott's conclusion is to the same effect: "The question will really turn on the amount of and nature of the changes. If they are few and good, they will be accepted; if not, they will not meet with acceptance either at home or abroad."

Another objection which has obtained wide currency is, that any step towards revision will unsettle men's minds. Even so sturdy an opponent as Lord Shaftesbury is constrained to admit that, perhaps, this argument comes too late. Men's minds are already unsettled, but not mainly through opinions recently expressed by "Bishops and Professors." We will say nothing of the written testimony of Biblical scholars, and the effect produced by this on the intelligent reading public; or of the influence exerted by religious controversies, which have so often turned on the correctness or incorrectness of certain renderings of Scripture. Scholars and controversialists may have wielded a great power by means of the press, but the power of the pulpit has been greater. What

has been more common than to hear an earnest, conscientious preacher, who does not venture to conceal his convictions as to the real meaning of a text of God's Word, bring forward his own correction, sometimes well-founded, at other times resting on principles which have long since been proved to be baseless? It may not be a wise procedure on the part of the preacher to "unsettle men's minds;" but that it is a common procedure, and that its motive is in very many instances both pure and praiseworthy, no one can for a moment doubt. Laymen complain, and with reason, that such assertions as those of which we are speaking are heard so frequently. Surely it is time that such "unsettling" should cease; but cease it never will until the ground for it is removed, in the removal of the errors which exist in our translation of the Scriptures: then, and not till then, will public opinion be able to frown down the unauthorised corrections of the pulpit. With Bishop Ellicott, we are convinced that "far from unsettling, a wise and authoritative revision would at the present time act exactly in the contrary way, and would probably tend more than can now even be imagined to tranquilise and to reassure." Let us not forget that, if the changes introduced bring us nearer to the true meaning of God's blessed Word, even the disturbance of men's minds may (as Archbishop Trench reminds us) be a real gain. It must be so, if it leads us to look more to the substance than to the form, and breaks up that "hard crust of formality which so easily overgrows our study of the Scripture." The Word may seem a "strange Gospel" at first, but it will be so only for a time. We wish we could believe that the majority of Bible readers were sufficiently familiar with the text to recognise many of the changes which would be made in any revised version; changes which, in spite of their minuteness, would on examination be declared by any candid mind really to throw light on the meaning of the Word.

With many other objections we must deal more briefly. We are told that the times are unfavourable; that, so wide is the divergence of men's opinions in this age of free thought, there is no chance of agreement amongst the scholars who might be intrusted with the work. The latter assertion is mere assertion. Those who make it have no conception of the extent to which all who are really scholars agree in their translation of the sacred text, especially that of the New Testament. Let anyone who doubts compare, for example, such a work as De Wette's German Version with our own, and mark how few examples he finds in which the theo-

logian's dogmatic bias has warped the work of the translator. There would be little difficulty in proving that the times, so far from being unfavourable, *demand* the execution of such work, if once it be proved to be desirable on its own account. We can conceive of nothing more injurious to the cause of truth, in an age remarkable for keenness of scrutiny and for intolerance of what rests on nothing better than prescription, than to appear more solicitous to preserve the letter of our Bibles than to exhibit the true meaning of the Word of God. Nor can we allow that the advocates of revision should be silenced by those who remind them of the failures of their predecessors. Not to speak of the advance in taste and skill which our most recent translators display, there are two characteristics by which most of the versions which are held up to such deserved obloquy are distinguished from any revision which would be thought of at the present day. In the first place, they are not revisions, but new translations: it cannot be too carefully explained that a new translation would not now be proposed by any scholar of responsible position or possessing any claim on our attention. Secondly, these translations were in most instances the work of individuals; and it is now clearly understood to be "impossible that *one man's work* can ever fulfil the requisites for an accepted version of the Scriptures."\* Bishop Ellicott has some interesting illustrations of this maxim, which our limits will not permit us to quote.

The strongest objection we have left until last. It is, that a revision "would encourage still further revisions, and that the great changes in our Version, which we all agree to deprecate, would be brought about by successive revisions,—in a word, that there would be no finality." As the Bishop of Gloucester remarks, this objection (which was mentioned by the Bishop of St. David's in Convocation)

"Is one which, by the nature of the case, it is not very easy to meet. We are transferred into the future, and have very few data derived from the past on which to hazard a forecast. Former revisions certainly succeeded each other after no lengthened intervals, but then they were revisions which were suggested by the existing state of the translation, and the changeful character of the times. We have now, as all are ready to admit, a thoroughly good, though not a perfect translation. It has maintained its ground in its present form for 260 years. It has secured a firm hold on the affections of the people. It has become also a sort of literary monument of which every

---

\* Preface to Dean Alford's *Revision of the New Testament*.



Englishman and every English critic of eminence (if we except a few ill-natured remarks of Mr. Hallam) is justly proud. These are facts which certainly seem to suggest the persuasion that one cautious and reverent retouching of the old picture might be tolerated, but that all parties, after they had accepted the work,—and this it would take time to bring about,—would very distinctly concur in deprecating any further manipulations. The really *monumental* character of our Version is its best protection against progressive change; and this protection, we cannot help feeling persuaded, as long as England is England, will always be found available and sufficient."

There would be a measure of force in some of the arguments alluded to above, if directed against a new *authorised* version, executed by a Royal Commission. As Lord Shaftesbury says, "there would be but small obedience to any Royal, Legislative, or Episcopal decree." At the outset of the present movement, the *Times* expressed a doubt "whether, in the altered circumstances of the present day, it is desirable to invoke the public authority on such a matter as the true rendering of the text of the Scriptures." We confess to entertaining more than a doubt on this head. We are convinced that the Government acted wisely in refusing to promote the appointment of a Royal Commission. One of the distinguishing excellencies of the plan which is now being tried is that the revised version will have no authority. Its success will depend entirely on its own merits. It is understood that, as soon as a portion is completed, it will be given to the world, that it may be submitted to the most complete examination. Criticism is courted, rejection is possible: and there can be no doubt that, if the work cannot stand the close scrutiny of impartial or even adverse criticism, rejection is certain. Hence there can be no risk in awaiting the attempt. We are not committed to any course; we can afford to wait and pronounce a candid judgment. Let us not give way to the jealousy of Convocation which is felt and expressed by some Dissenters. Whatever may be thought of its proceedings in general, even if it be unpractical, unprogressive, or narrow-minded, it has acted with wisdom and liberality in the present case. Nonconformists will not suffer themselves to be outdone in these good qualities.

No fitter conclusion can be found for this part of our subject than the words of one whose opinion will have weight with many of our readers. They relate, indeed, in part to questions which are not yet before us; but this does not lessen their appropriateness in this place:—

"I design, First, to set down the text itself, for the most part, in

the common English translation, which is, in general, so far as I can judge, abundantly the best that I have seen. Yet I do not say it is incapable of being brought, in several places, nearer to the original. Neither will I affirm that the Greek copies from which this translation was made are always the most correct; and therefore I shall take the liberty, as occasion may require, to make here and there a small alteration.

"I am very sensible this will be liable to objection; nay, to objections of quite opposite kinds. Some will probably think the text is altered too much; and others that it is altered too little. To the former I would observe, that I have never knowingly, so much as in one place, altered it for altering's sake; but there, and there only, where, First, the sense was made better, stronger, clearer, or more consistent with the context: Secondly, where, the sense being equally good, the phrase was better or nearer the original. To the latter, who think the alterations too few, and that the translation might have been nearer still, I answer, This is true; I acknowledge it might. But what valuable end would it have answered, to multiply such trivial alterations as add neither clearness nor strength to the text? This I could not prevail upon myself to do; so much the less, because there is, to my apprehension, I know not what peculiarly solemn and venerable in the old language of our translation. And suppose this to be a mistaken apprehension, and an instance of human infirmity; yet is it not an excusable infirmity, to be unwilling to part with what we have been long accustomed to, and to love the very words by which God has often conveyed strength or comfort to our souls?"

This extract from Mr. Wesley's Preface to his *Notes on the New Testament* brings before us the two distinct lines which our inquiry must follow. The question as to the necessity and practicability of revision must be asked in relation, first to the Greek text from which our version was made; secondly, to the character of the translation itself.

When our translators commenced their work, the chief printed editions of the Greek Testament were those of Erasmus, Stephens, and Beza, and that contained in the Complutensian Polyglott. By careful examination it has been ascertained that they did not adhere to any text then current, but followed sometimes Stephens, sometimes Beza. Of Stephens's four editions, that published in Geneva in the year 1551 seems to have been the one they used: in regard to the Greek text, however, this edition is almost a reprint of his folio edition of 1550. Beza's five editions differ but little in their Greek text: our translators probably used the fourth, which appeared in 1589. In the main, these two editions, the third of Stephens and the fourth of Beza, coincided in their text. Canon Westcott, in his article on the New Testa-

ment in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*,\* gives a list of sixty or sixty-one passages in which our translators have followed Beza when he differs from Stephens, and of twenty-seven or twenty-eight in which they agree with Stephens against Beza; in five or six they agree with neither editor, and in a few passages it cannot be determined with certainty which text they have used. Both these texts had a common basis, viz. that of the fifth and last edition of Erasmus's Greek Testament (1535); which again was almost a reprint of its predecessor, published in 1527. Bishop Ellicott thus sketches the history of the Erasmian text (pp. 92—36):—

"In the year 1516, Erasmus, after not much more than six months' labour, published at Basle an edition of the Greek Testament, and so got the start of the splendid Complutensian edition of Cardinal Ximenes, the New Testament portion of which, though then printed, had not been published, and was not published till a few years afterwards. Erasmus honestly says that his work was a 'precipitated' one. It was so: he was not insensible to the value of ancient testimony, and if he had allowed himself time would probably have given a better text to the world than that which is connected with his name; but the excusable though unfortunate desire to anticipate the lingering volume of the Complutensian edition marred the great work, and the evil effects of that six months of hurry last to this very hour. . . . This first edition of Erasmus was succeeded by a second in which there were about four hundred alterations, nearly three-fourths of which were, in the judgment of Mill, decidedly improvements. This edition was followed by the famous third edition, in which 1 John v. 7 first appeared; and owing to which the controversial troubles of Erasmus, already sufficiently great owing to his Latin Version, were considerably increased. Soon afterwards the Complutensian edition of the Greek Testament at length appeared to the world, and Erasmus was able to compare his own work with that of Stunica and Lebrixa, and to correct especially what most certainly needed correction, the text of the Revelation—the single manuscript which he used having here been imperfect, and, in the case of the concluding verses, actually so defective that, as we know, Erasmus had here to produce a text by re-translation of the Vulgate into his own Greek. In this fourth edition, which appeared in 1527, he consequently introduced changes in the text of the Revelation in about ninety places, and corrected and removed, though not wholly, what he had himself supplied. In other portions of Scripture there were very few changes made. The third edition had differed in 118 places from the second, but the fourth differed only in about 16" (that is, in 16 besides the 90 mentioned above) "places from the third. Such was the fourth edition of Erasmus, the mother-edition of the *Textus Receptus* and of our own Authorised Version. It

---

\* Vol. II. p. 524. See also Scrivener *Supplement to Auth. Ver.*, pp. 7, 8.

was based, as we have seen, on scanty evidence and late manuscripts. It contains two interpolations which the editor himself introduced on his own responsibility,—viz., Acts viii. 37, and words in Acts ix. 5, 6. It is especially unsatisfactory in the Revelation. Where in any degree dependent on a version, it is dependent only on a very bad and even deformed text of the Vulgate."

Nothing but a miracle could have secured accuracy to a text constructed in the manner above described. It is with devout thankfulness that we compare our store of critical materials with that which was possessed and used by the earliest editors of the text. The external evidence on which the textual criticism of the Greek Testament is based is derived from three principal sources. The testimony of Greek MSS., uncial and cursive, stands first in natural order, and also (in most instances) in importance. Next comes the evidence afforded by the ancient versions, as we are usually able to infer from the translation of a passage what reading of the Greek was before the translator. The third department of our critical apparatus consists of the quotations of Scripture found in the earliest Christian writers. In each of these departments our materials are abundant and most valuable. We have MSS. of all ages from the fourth century to the sixteenth, one of the two oldest (the *Codex Sinaiticus*) containing the whole of the New Testament. Of all the important uncials, and of some of the chief cursive MSS., we possess collations of remarkable accuracy, mainly from the hand of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Scrivener. Some of the MSS. have been published entire in a convenient form, and thus rendered accessible to the mass of students. Of the ancient versions our knowledge is less complete; but those whose value is greatest have been studied closely, and on the whole successfully. The most ancient Christian writings which we possess have been very carefully examined by recent scholars; and a body of quotations has been collected, which, in many instances, is of essential service in settling the text. In three respects only, perhaps, can we note deficiencies in our store of critical materials. In the first place, our knowledge of the later MSS. written in cursive letters is not extensive. Through the assiduous labours of Mr. Scrivener and others, we now occupy a position far in advance of that in which the critics of the last generation were placed; but there remains a wide field yet unexplored. The second deficiency is found in our acquaintance with the ancient versions. To this point Bishop Ellicott gives marked prominence. We cannot altogether agree with him in his belief

that it is in this department *only* that we are deficient; but our warmest thanks are due to him for the persistence with which he has urged the claims of some of the oriental versions which have been comparatively neglected, and for the labour and pains which he has himself bestowed on their critical study. Lastly, we are greatly in need of improved editions of the ancient Fathers and other Christian writers,—editions in which the text shall rest on a careful study of the best MSS. We have drawn attention to the unoccupied parts of the field, that it may the more clearly be understood how much has been brought under cultivation. In a few instances, no doubt, a fuller knowledge of critical evidence of all kinds would strike the balance in favour of a reading which now rests in uncertainty; but it must be remembered that in most such cases the contending readings are so nearly equal in authority, that any editor, or perhaps any body of revisers, would be bound to recognise *both*, giving to one a place in the margin, the other standing in the text. Whilst our stores of external evidence have thus, through the good providence of God, been so largely increased by the labours of recent years, the laws of internal evidence and the principles of criticism have been studied with zeal and success. We possess several critical texts of the Greek Testament, the work of editors of great eminence. Bishop Ellicott briefly reviews the editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, with a view to the inquiry which text should be used in a revision of our Version of the New Testament. His conclusion is, that no existing text can safely be taken as the basis of the Revised Version; that the wisest plan will be “to leave the Received Text as the standard, but to depart from it in every case where critical evidence and the *consent of the best editors* point out the necessity of the change” (p. 49). This is the plan which was actually followed by the “Five Clergymen,” and “found by experience not in any degree to be unmanageable or unsatisfactory in its results.”

The plan of this article does not permit more than a passing glance at the constitution of the Revision Committee which is now at work; but we cannot refrain from remarking that the presence of such names as those of Ellicott, Alford, Scrivener, Westcott, Hort, Lightfoot, and others, leaves no doubt that all questions of textual criticism will be considered with the greatest care, and that the various opinions held by scholars on certain points which are still unsettled will be fully represented in its discussions.

It would be too much to say that all the principles of

textual criticism are fully decided. There are still different bands of critics, but they are much less hostile than formerly, and their camps do not now lie very far apart. It is interesting to note the extent to which the leading editors are agreed in their judgment on very many passages. Let us take some portion of the Greek Testament in illustration of this statement. As we are dealing with the practical subject of an English version, we shall pass over those differences of reading which cannot be represented in translation. Of all others we take exact account.

We have chosen St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, valuable works on which have recently appeared. The commentaries of Ellicott, Alford, Lightfoot, Eadie, Meyer (ed. 5, 1870), and the Greek Testaments of Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. 7), and Tregelles, present careful revisions of the text of the Epistle. These eight authorities must be divided into two classes,—the texts of Lachmann (1850) and Tischendorf (1859) having been formed in the absence of valuable critical materials which we now possess: we refer, of course, mainly to the *Codex Sinaiticus*. In this Epistle of 149 verses, about forty-six changes of text by which the translation of the Greek could be affected are proposed by one or more of these eight editors. In twenty-eight of these forty-six changes, Ellicott, Alford, Lightfoot, Eadie, Meyer, Tregelles—the six whose text is constructed on the basis of the whole evidence which we now possess—are agreed; and in almost all these instances (perhaps in twenty-six out of the twenty-eight) their decision either is already confirmed by the other two, or would almost certainly have the suffrages of these editors were the decision given (by each according to his own principles) on a survey of the evidence which is *now* accessible. In four of these passages, however, it is probable that no translators would really wish to change the rendering; these, therefore, may be removed from the list. There remain twenty-seven readings in which editors may be said to be agreed, and fifteen in which there is more or less difference of opinion. In at least four of these fifteen last-named instances a very decided majority of votes is against making any change in the text; in some others the majority in favour of the ordinary text would be clear, though not so large. We are left, then, with less than a dozen passages in which the true reading may be pronounced doubtful. In some of these the evidence is so conflicting that both readings have a claim to be represented to the English reader, by means of the text and the margin. In one of the passages about



which editors are divided in opinion, viz. ch. iv. 15, our translators have themselves given a rendering of both readings ("where is," and "what was"). In another (ch. vi. 16), the rendering "walk" answers to the *corrected* reading, "shall walk" being the equivalent of the Greek word in the ordinary text; so that no change will be needed in the Authorised Version *unless* we change the text. A similar phenomenon presents itself in ch. iv. 8, "which by nature are no gods" being a more exact translation of the true reading than of that which was before the translators. Similarly, in ch. v. 20 our version has the word "variance" in the singular number, anticipating the result of recent criticism, which has substituted a singular for a plural noun in the Greek text. To some of our readers the change of even as many as twenty-seven readings in 149 verses may seem alarming. Most of these changes, however, though forced upon us by evidence which we cannot resist, will be found but slightly to affect the sense. For example, we must read Cephas for Peter in three places (i. 18, ii. 11, 14); "for" should be omitted in i. 10 (latter half), should stand in the place of "and" in iv. 25, v. 17; "we" should be changed into "ye" in iv. 28, and (the first) "my" into "your" in iv. 14; "and" should be left out in iii. 29, "all" in iv. 26, "the" (before "two") in iv. 24. The most important alterations are in iii. 1, where the clause "that ye should not obey the truth" is omitted by all the editors, and also by commentators who less frequently alter the text (*e.g.* Wesley); iii. 17, if the words "in Christ" be omitted; iv. 7, "an heir through God;" iv. 25, if we omit "Hagar;" v. 19, omitting "adultery;" v. 1, where it is very difficult to determine the true reading, though that of the ordinary text cannot stand; vi. 15, omitting the words "in Christ Jesus;" vi. 17, reading "of Jesus."

In the latter half of his volume the Bishop of Gloucester furnishes a rendering of Matt. v—vii, Rom. v—viii, to illustrate the practical working of the principles previously laid down. To the great care and ability with which the translation is executed we can only refer in passing: we have now to do with the passages in which he allows himself to change the Greek text. Our limits will not permit us to do more than state the results of examination. In Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, the Bishop proposes about twenty changes of reading. He himself states the number as nineteen; but the two in v. 47 should surely be reckoned separately, and, perhaps, the same might be said of those in vi. 5,

21. In two other verses he retains the ordinary reading, with an expression of serious doubt as to its correctness. In nineteen out of twenty passages his judgment is fully supported by that of most recent editors: the exception is found in vii. 10, where the evidence seems in favour of the reading adopted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Alford, in which "if" is omitted. There are a few other verses in which it may be thought that the reading should have been changed (as vi. 33, vii. 15, 24); but on the whole Bishop Ellicott seems to have used a wise discretion in his treatment of the text. In Rom. v—viii he proposes only eleven alterations in the text used by our translators, one of these having already a place in the margin of our Bibles (vii. 6). In viii. 11, where editors usually incline to the reading which is translated in our margin, Bishop Ellicott prefers that which is in the text. We cannot understand how it is that vii. 13 is left unchanged: the adoption of the reading which has the support of the majority of editors would remove the necessity of correcting the translation. Two or three other readings are doubtful: perhaps the principle of making as few alterations as possible may justify their being left unnoticed. On the whole, then, the amount of change that is required in the seven chapters translated in this volume, though certainly not over-estimated by the learned author, is not fixed by him much below the mark at which the suffrages of our most recent and most accurate editors would place it. If instead of thirty alterations we say thirty-five, in the course of the 219 verses, we have a proportion of one change in six verses. This is still below the general average as estimated by the Bishop himself, who thinks that the amount of change in the Greek text will be at the rate of one correction in five verses. We are inclined to think that this last estimate will prove rather below the mark for the whole New Testament. The only guarantee for permanence is thoroughness of work; and it is better that the text should undergo corrections in a somewhat larger number of passages than that, through over-caution, a plea should be left open for a second revision at no great distance of time. We have already called attention to the small intrinsic importance of many of the changes introduced. Some will ask,—Why make them? Why not limit the corrector's work to errors of clear importance? We answer, because we have no right to adopt any rule but the plain one of following evidence in each case. The principles which remove accretions which everyone acknowledges to be no part of the original, are those which regulate the jots and

titles of the text. It is hard to think that any serious, candid man can wish to have in his Bible words which have nothing corresponding to them in any known Greek MS. whatever (this is the case with thirty words in Acts ix. 5, 6), or which are not found in the text of any Greek MS. earlier than the fifteenth century (1 John v. 7). Those who, in the true Protestant spirit, seek to try all things by the Word of God, should desire above all to have that Word in its integrity, with no addition, with no erasure, by the hand of human scribe. It is idle to bid us wait till we can arrive at absolute certainty in regard to every point. True, there is need for caution. We rejoice that the love for our Version as it is will lead men to weigh thoroughly all proposed changes. Let us be slow of conviction; let us apply a rigorous criticism to all that is submitted to our notice in so important a matter as this; but let us banish prejudice, and guard against the spirit which rejects before it has seen or heard. The doctrines of our faith will not suffer by any changes that may be made. No doubt, certain "proof-texts" will be taken away, but then others will take their place, and others, again, will be left untouched. It is a gain to lose an unreal support. It would be very easy to illustrate these positions if we had space; anyone who has access to a critical edition of the Greek Testament may convince himself of their truth.

We have delayed longer than we had intended on this more technical part of the subject, on account of its acknowledged difficulty. That which remains to be considered is more familiar to an English reader. Granted that our Version needs correction in respect of the Greek from which it is derived, what is its character as a translation? The history of English translations of the Bible has been recently traced in these pages,\* and we shall, as far as possible, abstain from travelling over the same ground.

Our Authorised Version was but the last in a series of revisions. A curious evidence of this fact is furnished by the Book of Common Prayer, which contains memorials of all the most important stages in the history of our Bible. Many of the detached sentences in the Liturgy are independent translations (probably from the hand of Cranmer); the Psalter (taken from the Great Bible) is mainly the work of Coverdale; whilst the Epistles and Gospels belong to our present Version.† The pedigree of the Authorised Version is briefly

\* No. LXIV., July 1869, p. 265, &c.

† See Westcott's *History of the English Bible*, p. 367, &c.

traced in the work before us, the author taking for text the following sentence from the Preface to Bosworth and Waring's *Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels*: "Our present English Version was based upon the Bishops' Bible of 1568, and that upon Cranmer's of 1539 (the Great Bible), which was a new edition of Matthew's Bible of 1537, partly from Coverdale of 1535, but chiefly from Tyndale; in other words, our Authorised Version is mainly that of Tyndale made from the original Hebrew and Greek." Tyndale's character, scholarship, and labours are themes on which the Bishop loves to dwell. It is strange that our debt to this noble man has been so imperfectly acknowledged even in our own day. Through the exertions of some recent writers, the measure of his work is becoming more truly appreciated. If it be true that by far the greater part of his translation remains intact in our present Bibles; that "all that makes our Version what it essentially is, its language, tone, rhythm, vigour, and breadth, are due to him;" surely no name amongst England's worthies should be more honoured, more dear to our hearts, than that of William Tyndale.

It is deeply interesting to follow the alterations which were introduced into Tyndale's version from time to time between 1525 and 1611, and to endeavour to trace the influences to which each change was due. The Bishop of Gloucester institutes such a comparison between the first and last links in this series, selecting for examination Luke xvi. 19-31, Acts xxvii. 27-44, 2 Thess. ii. 1-17. These passages furnish illustrations of the difficulties felt by successive revisers, and of the manner in which these were met. We must refer the reader to the Bishop's work (pp. 61-78), with the assurance that he will there find much that will repay examination and careful thought. Whilst it is undoubtedly true that "each succeeding version contributed something by way of correction to the labours of Tyndale," attention should, we think, be drawn to the many instances in which Tyndale's rendering would now be regarded by any body of scholars as substantially superior to that of the Authorised Version. We take a few examples almost at random. In Heb. xiii. 4, "Let wedlock be had in price in all points" may not be the best translation, but it expresses the meaning more correctly than "marriage is honourable in all." The same may be said of Heb. x. 38, "and if he withdraw himself;" John x. 16, "one flock;" John xiv. 1, "believe in God;" 1 Tim. ii. 8, "the men;" of Heb. ii. 1, v. 7, xi. 1, Matt. i. 20, John xvi. 23, Matt. xxv. 8, v. 21, Phil. ii. 10, Luke i. 3, 1 Pet. iii. 19, 2 Pet. i. 5,

1 Thess. iv. 14, &c. A similar remark may be made with regard to other English versions. Without going into detail, we will give the results of an examination of one of St. Paul's shorter Epistles. The translation given by Bishop Ellicott in his commentaries is accompanied by a collation of our earlier versions. This translation, we are most carefully reminded, is not intended "as a specimen of what might be thought a desirable form of an authoritative revision:" it is professedly "a version for the closet," and some considerations which would otherwise be of weight are confessedly passed over in it. Hence the number of changes introduced in this translation may reasonably be expected to be considerably in excess of those which a body of revisers would venture to make. In the translations of the Epistle to the Philippians, Dr. Ellicott proposes about 271 changes: in 124 of these, the change is (*literally* in seventy-seven instances, *substantially* in the remaining forty-seven) a return to the rendering of one or more of our earlier versions. Here is an answer to much that we hear on the change in the language which revision will effect. Unless the Committee of Revisers are animated by a spirit very different from that of their leader, there is no danger that the language and style will be modernised or "Frenchified." Again and again the old will be removed, only to give place to that which is older still.

An instructive volume might be written on the history of the Authorised Version between 1611 and the present time. The opinions entertained respecting it, the character and motives of its assailants, the grounds on which new versions were proposed, and the principles of their construction, the influence which its language and style have exercised on the national literature, the effect of the Version itself on the history of doctrine in England, would, if carefully traced, supply material for many an interesting chapter. We are now more directly concerned with the present and the future. During this period, however, many unauthorised changes have been introduced. The spelling has been modernised by the printer from time to time, and many antiquated forms have thus been removed from view. Thus we no longer read *charet*, *damosell*, *lancer* (for *lancet*), *set* (for *fetched*), *moneth*, *thorowout*, *yer* (for *ere*), *aliant*, *fornace*, *heat* (for *heated*), &c. But for such changes the need of revision would now be more keenly felt. But surely it is not desirable that alterations, even of this kind, should be made by irresponsible persons, and without authority. This becomes more evident if we notice that the printer has now and then really changed

the character of a word, in his wish to banish what was obsolete; thus (as Archbishop Trench remarks) "shamefastness" is not "shamefacedness," nor is "broided" the same as "broidered." The substitution of "its" for "it" in Lev. xxv. 5 introduces a form which was extremely rare when the Version was made.

In other respects also

"There has been, to a greater extent than is commonly known, a work of unauthorised revision. Neither italics, nor references, nor readings, nor chapter-headings, nor, it may be added, punctuation, are the same now as they were in the Authorised Version of 1611. The chief alterations appear to have been made first in 1683, and afterwards in 1769, by Dr. Blayney, under the sanction of the Oxford Delegates of the press (*Gentleman's Magazine*, Nov., 1789). A like work was done about the same time by Dr. Paris, at Cambridge. There had, however, been some changes previously. The edition of 1638, in particular, shows considerable augmentation in the italics (Turton, *Text of the English Bible*, 1833, pp. 91, 126). To Blayney also we owe most of the notes on weights and measures, and coins, and the explanation, where the text seems to require it, of Hebrew proper names."—*Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 1682.

We do not pause to give examples, remarking only that these facts of themselves are sufficient to suggest the need of a careful and systematic examination of the text in regard to these minor but still important matters.

The Bishop of Gloucester enters into a careful investigation of the graver question,—What mistakes and imperfections are found in our Version, viewed as a translation of the Greek? He classifies these under the head of errors, inaccuracies, and renderings which are either insufficient, or inconsistent, or obscure. The "inaccuracies" he examines as a grammarian, pointing out errors in the rendering of cases, tenses, prepositions, particles, &c. Dean Stanley, in the Preface to his *Commentary on Corinthians*, gives a list of corrections needed, arranged on a similar plan. These classifications are very convenient from the scholar's point of view. His thesis is: given the Greek Testament, how to translate it most perfectly into idiomatic English. On the other hand, the question we would ask is: given the Authorised Version, can it be shown that it contains mistakes sufficient in number and gravity to justify our encountering the perils of change? The English reader is not wholly dependent on the judgment of Greek scholars for an answer to this question. There are difficulties and peculiarities which attract the attention of all



careful observers, and which are in great measure familiar to every educated man. Hitherto these have been looked on as unavoidable. Every science has its initial difficulties and its technical terms; and if the intelligent study of the English Bible required some amount of preparation, this—it was argued—could excite no surprise. From a literary point of view, such preparation would be most desirable. In the peculiar forms and words is wrapped up the history of many changes in our language; words which have now no place in the vocabulary of English writers survive in provincial dialects (*knap*, *palmerworm*, *fitches*, *canker*, *blain*, &c.). Whilst the prospect of revision was distant, there was much excuse for those who thus dealt with the Book as a noble specimen of English, and made the best of that which could not be removed. We are now called to take a higher view. Whatever prevents the Bible from speaking with perfect clearness to the masses of our people ought, if possible, to be removed. "To the poor the Gospel is preached."

The principles upon which italics are employed are sometimes far from clear. The reader usually finds some small connective word thus written, or some word which the context readily suggests. Knowing that in these instances our translators have supplied a word, he is at a loss to know what to make of such passages as 1 John ii. 23, where half a verse is in this character, or Ps. cxix. 113, 1 Tim. iv. 3, where the supplements must seem extremely bold. This, however, is comparatively a small matter, as is also the eccentricity observable in the chapter and verse divisions, examples of which will readily present themselves. It would be very possible to make whatever change is needed in these respects, and also in the punctuation, without encountering the graver difficulties of a complete revision. Every observed imperfection renders the necessity of improvement more evident, but the proof of this necessity must rest on other grounds.

These grounds are, in our belief, furnished by the errors and inaccuracies which exist in the rendering of the Greek. Their number has been exaggerated, it is true. The statements which some have made have only served to prove that the authors of them possessed no sufficient knowledge either of English or of Greek. Still, making all needful deductions, there remains a large number of passages in which the English reader receives a wrong impression of the meaning of Holy Writ. It is not a pleasant task to collect examples of such mistakes. We are reminded of Addison's critic, who received the chaff for his labour. There is, moreover, a

serious objection to any examination of this kind which does not aim at completeness. The few examples which, within our limits, we are able to give fail to convey any adequate impression of the real state of the case. Some examples, however, we are bound to offer. If any reader, as yet undecided, be convinced by these, he certainly will not waver when the whole number is brought before him. If the meagreness of our proof leave him still in doubt, we can only assure him that the real store of illustrations is large; that much more than we have given remains behind. In the following list we do not profess to suggest the word or phrase which should be used in a revised version; we endeavour to point out the true meaning of the words mistranslated (as we believe) in our Authorised Version.

In 2 Cor. v. 14, for "then were all dead," we should read, "then (*or* therefore) all died;" in Acts iii. 19, "that times of refreshing may come;" Acts vii. 59, "invoking (*or* praying) and saying;" Heb. vi. 6, "and have fallen away;" Acts xix. 2, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed (*or* became believers)?" Gal. v. 17, "that ye may not do the things that ye would;" Heb. x. 38, "if he draw back;" Rom. iii. 25, "because of the passing over;" Heb. xiii. 8, "Jesus Christ is the same;" 1 Thess. iv. 14, "those who fell asleep (were laid to sleep) through Jesus;" John x. 16, "one flock;" 1 Thess. v. 22, "every form of evil;" John viii. 58, "before Abraham was born (*or* was made), I am;" Acts ii. 47, "those who were saved (*or* were being saved);" John v. 18, "His own Father;" Rom. v. 15, "the many died;" Acts iv. 27, 20, "servant" (*for* child); 1 Pet. i. 17, "If ye call Him Father;" 1 Tim. iv. 2, "in the hypocrisy of those who speak lies;" Matt. xxv. 8, "are going out;" 1 Tim. vi. 5, "that godliness is a gain" (a means of gain); Luke xxi. 19, "save (gain) ye your souls;" Luke i. 3, "having carefully traced all things;" 2 Cor. ii. 14, "who always leadeth us in triumph;" Acts xvii. 22, "very observant of religion;" Rev. iv. 6, &c., "living beings;" Phil. iii. 20, "our country;" Matt. xxiii. 24, "strain out a gnat." In several passages, as 2 Pet. iii. 12, Rom. v. 11, John xiv. 18, xvi. 8, xv. 5, Heb. iv. 11, vi. 7, xi. 31, John v. 2, Mark vii. 4, Luke ii. 1, 1 Cor. xi. 29, xiii. 6, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Eph. iv. 18, 1 Thess. i. 4, iv. 6, 2 Thess. iii. 5, Tit. ii. 11, &c., and probably in Heb. v. 7, Matt. v. 21, &c., the margin is decidedly preferable to the text. In this list we have not included passages in which there is merely a slight inaccuracy; though in very many instances minute changes serve to render the meaning much more evi-

dent and increase the force of the words. Nor have we noticed the very remarkable examples of inconsistency of rendering. This cannot be considered a fault unless it is carried beyond certain limits. When, however, we notice that one Greek word which occurs twenty-seven times in all receives seventeen different renderings; that the word "trouble" is used as an equivalent for no fewer than ten or twelve Greek words; that in the Synoptical Gospels, in Ephesians and Colossians, and in 2 Peter and Jude (where the translator's aim should be to reproduce in English the coincidence presented by the Greek), the same Greek word is very often differently rendered in corresponding sections; it will be evident to all that these limits have been overpassed.

We have left ourselves but little space for noticing the suggestions which Bishop Ellicott offers to the body of revisers, as to the best mode of carrying out their work. His first principle is, that "there must be frequent conference, and the combined action of several minds;" that whilst "previous and formal preparation in private" is essential, the actual work of "revision must be done round a common table." The second is, that "experience must be relied on as the only ultimately successful teacher in the difficult work; in other words, the work must at first be done tentatively." Most of the remaining suggestions we have spoken of by anticipation. We cannot do better than add the summary of the whole which the Bishop gives in a single sentence (p. 219):—

"Do your work together; consider experience your truest guide; don't try to 'improve' our present Version, but be satisfied with correcting it; use the old words, and have an ear for the old rhythm; don't decide till afterthought has exercised its due influence; make the text better than the margin; and, lastly, follow the spirit of the old rules,"—

*i.e.* the rules which were laid down for the guidance of the translators of the Authorised Version.

The proceedings of the revisers will be watched with the keenest interest by all thoughtful believers in Christianity. If the present experiment fail, it will be long before the Authorised Version is again disturbed. If it succeed, it will be a blessing beyond price. Bishop Ellicott is not one of those who expect immediate results. He says (p. 221):—

"Even with the most prospered issues, a generation must pass away ere the labours of the present time will be so far recognised as to take the place of the labours of the past. The youngest scholar that may be called

upon to bear his part in the great undertaking will have fallen on sleep before the labours in which he may have shared will be regarded as fully bearing their hoped-for fruit. The latest survivor of the gathered company will be resting in the calm of Paradise ere the work at which he toiled will meet with the reception which, by the blessing of God the Holy Ghost, it may ultimately be found to deserve. The bread will be cast upon the waters, but it will not be found till after many days."

Already some difficulties, which had to many seemed formidable, have passed away. Churchmen and Dissenters have thankfully fraternised in the service of God's Holy Word. They have met together round the table of their common Lord. Let us accept this harmony of labour, this oneness of spirit, as a prophecy of good, and an earnest of the Divine blessing for the work in which they are engaged, and for the churches to which they belong. Let us pray that the words of hope which the Bishop of Gloucester joins to his hearty welcome to Nonconformist scholars may receive their fulfilment in regard to churches as well as individuals:—"The men who may sit round the council table of revision will be bound by the holy bond of reverence for the same Book, and adoration for the same Lord. Those whom God may vouchsafe to join together in a holy work, sectarian bitterness will never be able to put asunder" (p. 23).

---

ART. X.—*The Session of 1870.*

THE Session of 1869 will fix an era in the history of British legislation, because in that year the relations between the State and the Established Church in Ireland were dissolved ; the Session of 1870 will long be memorable, because the Land Bill for Ireland and the Elementary Education Bill for England have in this Session become law.

For sixty years before 1869 it would have been hard to find a dispassionate person of competent ability, of whatever party in politics, who had studied the history and facts of the case, as respected the relations of Church and State in Ireland, and was prepared to deny that there were such and so many anomalies, and such glaring violations of equity and propriety, in the existing condition of things, as to demand at least some decisive measure of reform. The changes, indeed, which were made in the Irish Church nearly forty years ago, were not only concessions, significant though inadequate, to the urgent demands of the case, but they did in fact embody and express a principle of dealing with Church property held and administered under exceptional circumstances such as, rigorously applied, might, under assignable conditions, have led even to the disestablishment of the Church. Two things at the same time needed to be distinctly marked in connection with the case of the Irish Church ; one, that the case stood altogether apart, there being no parallel or analogy to it within the British dominion, and very few beyond the realm, inasmuch as it was the case of a Church reformed, not from within itself or the country on which it was imposed, but almost wholly by the high and violent hand of State policy from without, by the power and pressure of an alien and dominant nation,—of a Church, moreover, maintained at the charge of the soil of the whole island in direct antagonism to the religious faith and the deepest feelings of a very large majority of the people ; the other, that, pressing as the Church question might be, it was but a part, and much the smaller part, of the whole case, as respected Ireland. The former of these considerations may avail to prevent the hasty inference that the disestablishment of the Irish Church involves, by direct consequence, the disestablishment of the English Church ; while the latter points

to the fact that the Church Bill would have been not only an inadequate, but an inapt—an inept—prescription for the case of Ireland, if it had not been intended to follow it up by such a Land Bill as that which has during the past Session become law.

Of that Land Bill we have nothing but good to say. It agrees strictly with the principles of legislation in regard to the property and tenure of land which have from the first been advocated in this Journal. It agrees remarkably with the views stated in an article on the "Irish Land Question" contributed to the pages of this Review two years ago by the late accomplished scholar and thinker, Mr. Monsell, of Neufchâtel, himself an Irishman trained at Trinity College. It redresses conditions of law and legalised custom as to land tenure which were in the highest degree inequitable, and altogether without parallel in the history of the world; it secures to the tenant the fruits of his own industry, and makes it worth his while to farm well, to keep his cottage decent, and in all ways to improve his holding. At the same time, it avoids the error of stereotyping, however it may legalise, any existing custom, and leaves the way open for the adoption, and for the extension, through the country, of any system of lease-contracts which may prove to be mutually advantageous to the tenant and the landowner.

A basis has now been laid for the settlement of Ireland. Equity has been satisfied; the really industrious and reasonable tenant will find himself effectually protected and encouraged, and the way of enterprise and prosperity opened before him will give him something more profitable and more pleasant to do than to menace and agitate. The tenant class, having themselves acquired a sense of property in land, and of the rights of property, will acquire a rooted respect for the rights of property in general, especially landed property: and, since Ireland is so predominantly agricultural, and the number of land-holders (not owners) is very much larger than in England; and, even although one of the effects, as Lord Derby has shown, of Mr. Gladstone's Bill may be to promote the consolidation rather than the multiplication of farms (in Ireland a most desirable result), the number of holders is likely to remain much larger than in England;—we anticipate, accordingly, at no very distant date, that a preponderant proportion of the Irish population will have become as conservative as all small and well-to-do owners or holders of land always are, whether in Belgium, in North Italy, in France, in Norway, in



the Channel Islands, or in Cumberland and in Dumfriesshire. We do not, indeed, expect such a result to be realised immediately ; it will be some years before the beginning of a general change in this respect will be recognisable ; it will be more than a few years before so great a transformation will have been generally accomplished ; the bitter and evil results which have been produced by three centuries cannot be effaced in a year, hardly in a generation. But we have no doubt whatever that the same causes which everywhere else, apart altogether from any question of religion, have produced industry, thrift, and strong conservative antipathy to disturbance, disorder, and all social agitation or misrule, will produce their necessary effects in Ireland. In one considerable portion of Ireland, in Ulster, the same effects from the like causes have been produced already, irrespective to a large extent of religious creed. If Ulster is now agitated, the agitation there is not agrarian, but purely religious, and has been kindled afresh or greatly exasperated by the first effects of the Irish Church Bill. Elsewhere the effect of the Church Bill has been quite different ; and we doubt not that in Ulster the present paroxysm will presently pass away. Ulster, now that Protestantism has lost its legal dominancy, wishes to be freed from its parliamentary connection with England, that it may assert its proud pre-eminence of intellect, will, and Protestant enlightenment in an Irish parliament, being fully persuaded that it is more than a match, whether in Parliament or on the field of civil conflict, for all the rest of the kingdom, even though it be double in population and treble in area. On the other hand, many Roman Catholics, with hereditary consistency, are prepared to demand the repeal of the Union, that, in their own parliament, they may have full scope for the assertion and discussion of Irish claims and Celtic grievances, instead of occupying but a section of the field and some part of the attention of the Imperial Legislature. But for the Ulster ecclesiastical rage, the old cry of Celtic sedition and " Catholic " discontent on the subject of Repeal would not have been able to make itself heard again. Never was there so little excuse for this cry as of late. The British Parliament has done more generous, more statesman-like, and more effectual justice to Ireland, than any Parliament in College Green could ever have done. Therefore we doubt not that the Ulster rage will presently die out, and the present ill-timed and ill-omened cry will wail away into silence.

One effect of the Irish Land Bill will, we are persuaded, be to improve the character of the Roman Catholic religion in

Ireland. The past relations between England and Ireland, between the Established Church and the great majority of the Irish population, and especially between the landowners and the tenantry, combined to embitter the religious animosities between the Protestant dominant minority and the Roman Catholic majority, to degrade the whole character, intellectually and morally, of the Roman Catholic cottier, so as to make him the fit and prone recipient and slave of an abject, yet congenial, superstition, and, at the same time, to cast him upon his priest as his only guide and champion, and upon the priesthood as the order to which he naturally looked for sympathy and defence in presence of an alien and dominant landed aristocracy. Hence, while in continental Europe the people have been gradually rising from their abject servitude to priest and pope, in Ireland the old bondage has been riveted firmly on the souls of all but a narrow, though gradually widening, circle of liberally educated Roman Catholics. We anticipate, henceforward, a gradual emergence from this lamentable condition of things. At first, indeed, it is not unlikely the demon may tear the nation from which it is to be cast out, and may hurl it into the fire. But we may repeat here what has before been said in this Journal:—"It is not too much to say that Popery is a religion congenial to a population which is in the condition of the peasantry of Ireland, and that Protestantism can never flourish among such a population. It is certain that, in order to diffuse Protestantism throughout Ireland, the Irish population must be economically redeemed and socially elevated." It is a shallow political diagnosis which resolves all the evils in the condition of Ireland into the one evil of Popery. The truth is, that "the evil of Popery in Ireland," again to quote from a former article in this Journal, "has but aggravated, and has in turn been aggravated by, a social evil yet more fundamental. The first step towards nationalising, mitigating, and de-Ultramontanising, the Romanism of Ireland is to make such reforms" as have now been made.

We regret, however, that Mr. Gladstone's Government, as one of their latest acts during the past Session, have passed a measure for facilitating the acquisition of glebes and parsonages by the Irish clergy of the Roman Catholic and the non-Episcopalian Protestant communions. The exceedingly, we may say the inconsistently, generous terms on which they had dealt with the clergy of the disestablished Church seemed to make this measure expedient. Not the less we greatly regret it. We know that the State will only lend money on

fair commercial terms, and on excellent guarantees, to the different churches; but we think it was an unwise and an indefensible thing—a radical mistake in policy—for the State to enter needlessly and afresh into any sort of relations with any church. All voluntary and artificial State-Concordats with churches are, in our judgment, evil, and cannot but lead to complications and incompatibilities of mischievous tendency. But, besides this general consideration, it is impolitic, inconsistent, and undignified, as we venture to think, for the legislation of a Protestant nation to recognise, and to undertake relations with, priests and fraternities whose vow binds them, in regard to all questions of faith and authority, in regard to the ultimate allegiance of spirit, soul, and body, to the Roman Papacy.

One of the best results of the late legislation for Ireland will be that the Viceregal administration will be able to be just and impartial, and to respect the claims of Protestants to office and preferment, as fully as of Roman Catholics. Hitherto it has been otherwise. Whatever Government has been in power has endeavoured to conciliate by administration, to compensate by undue favour to Roman Catholics, in appointments and promotions, for grievances pressing upon the majority of the nation which it felt itself unable to redress by legislation. Legislation has now done its part with signal generosity. It remains for the Government to be firm and just, to be altogether impartial in appointments, in promotion and, especially, in the maintenance of order and enforcement of law. Mr. Gladstone must govern Ireland with a wise and benevolent strength. While Orange bigotry is not favoured, Roman Catholic intrigues must be defied and quashed, and Ultramontane demands rejected with just and steadfast disdain. Equity and generosity have laid a basis on which the Government may firmly stand in its maintenance of law and its opposition to Romish ambition.

As to the Education Bill, which has become law for England, we do not need to say much. All that we wrote on this subject in our January and April Numbers has been amply and remarkably justified. A large proportion of our own proposals are embodied in the Act to which her Majesty has given her assent. Our prognostications in regard to the manner in which the measure would be received by Parliament, by the churches, and by the country, have been accurately fulfilled. Our most serious and fundamental objection to the Bill as it stood has been fully borne out by the discussions in Parliament and by the admissions of the Govern-

ment. Its great weakness and failure is, that it makes no general and effectual provision for compelling the education of children not at present sent to school, and for securing the regular attendance of those who professedly attend school. All that the Act provides for is *partial and permissive direct compulsion*. *Direct compulsion*, as we showed,—and Lord Shaftesbury repeated our argument in the House of Lords,—can never reach the classes which most stand in need of educational compulsion; and no Government could attempt, at least as yet, to make *direct compulsion general*. For the *indirect compulsion* which might have been *generally applied*, and which might, in particular, have been made to reach a large proportion of those migratory classes to which direct compulsion cannot be applied, the measure makes no provision.

In another respect the measure, as it stands, is not only different from what we had desired, but from the first draft as submitted to Parliament. There is no provision now for aiding denominational or British schools out of the local rates, or for harmonising these and the new School Board Schools into one system. The omission of this feature of the Bill has, in our judgment, lowered its character as a statesmanlike measure. The Government, however, found it impossible to retain this provision. The general feeling of the country demanded that *locally-aided*—that is, *rate-aided*—denominational schools should forego their denominational Catechisms. Against this demand a very large proportion of the clergy of the Church of England protested; while the Roman Catholics pleaded that, as they do not use and appeal to the Bible in their schools as Protestants do, but in fact use the Catechism alone as their recognised compendium of truth and standard of authority on moral and religious subjects, to exclude the Catechism from their schools would be equivalent to excluding both Catechism and Bible from Protestant schools. They pleaded also that, throughout the Irish National Schools, whether vested or non-vested, and even in the Model Schools, the Catechisms of the respective denominations are universally taught, and that it would be manifestly unfair to allow them less religious and educational liberty in England in their so-called Denominational Schools than has from the first been not only allowed, but even prescribed, in the (so-called) National Schools of Ireland. Pressed thus, on opposite sides, by reasons which, from the respective points of view of those who urged them, seemed scarcely to admit of an effectual reply, the Government cut the knot by

removing Denominational and British Schools,—all, in fact, except the new School Board Schools,—from the scope of School Board administration, and from the aid of local rates.

We repeat that we regret that no more satisfactory solution of the difficulty could be arrived at. The failure of the Bill in this respect to meet the whole case will probably render necessary, some ten years hence or more, a new attempt at combining, in some system of complex harmony and comprehensive unity, all inspected schools under trained and certified teachers. Meantime, however, the Government measure is, in many respects, so admirable, and has been so much improved, especially in the directions which have been indicated in this Journal, and by other exponents of moderate Nonconformist, and in particular of Wesleyan Methodist, opinion, that we cannot but hail its passing with great satisfaction. Already the country is thrilling under its impulse into educational activity. The large towns are setting up School Boards. The parishes are bestirring themselves. The denominations are alive with stimulated zeal.

We rejoice especially that, whatever schools the denominations may set up, they must hereafter (*i.e.* after the end of this year) pay wholly for the buildings themselves, and receive no money except as a grant on ascertained proficiency in secular knowledge; that in all schools receiving grants, a stringent and efficient conscience-clause will be enforced; that inspection by denominational inspectors in religious knowledge is brought to an end. Ten years of Mr. Forster's Bill will put the country far on the road towards universal education. Only it must be speedily reinforced in its working by a combination of measures for indirect educational compulsion.

Some important measures introduced by the Government stand over till another Session. Among these the University Tests' Bill came the nearest to passing. It will pass next year. The Succession Bill and the Transfer of Landed Property Bill are truly liberal measures,—measures not of revolution, but of important *seminal* reform, the value of which is little understood by mere political partisanship of a Whig-Radical complexion, but is justly appreciated by scientific and patriotic economists, whether called Conservatives or Advanced Liberals. The Lord Chancellor's Bills for the Reform of our Law Courts will be reintroduced next year in an improved form, and will, it may be hoped, be passed into law without delay.

Here our limit constrains us, and we cut short our review of a most laborious and critical Session.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

---

### I. THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

**Outlines of Moral Philosophy.** By Dugald Stewart, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. With a Memoir, a Supplement, and Questions. By James M'Cosh, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's University in Ireland, and Author of "The Method of Divine Government," "The Intuitions of the Mind," &c. New Edition. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston.

CAMBRIDGE undergraduates, who intend to take an ordinary theological degree, are required previously to satisfy the examiners in one paper on moral or natural science; and on moral science the book before us is the prescribed text-book. The subject itself most fitly precedes or accompanies the labours of the young theological student, especially in the present day; while, as to the fitness of these "Outlines" for a text-book, we endorse Dr. M'Cosh's critique in his memoir of the author. Enumerating the late professor's writings, he says, "Among these works the *Outlines of Moral Philosophy* are peculiarly valuable, inasmuch as they contain in a condensed form the principles which he has unfolded and illustrated in his various philosophical treatises. In some of his other works he is deficient in directness of statement, and is too diffuse in general; but in this little treatise he has compressed his thoughts, so characterised by the ripeness of wisdom, within as brief a compass as is consistent with clearness, which, I may add, is a pre-eminent excellence of the work. It is one of the best text-books of mental and moral science ever written. It has not been superseded; it has not even become antiquated. To bring it up to the times it needs only a few supplementary notes introducing the student to discussions which have been brought into prominence by such eminent men as Kant, Sir W. Hamilton, and Mr. J. S. Mill."

Dr. M'Cosh has supplemented and edited the "Outlines" in a manner worthy of his known reputation. Reading them we have wished constantly that the theological domain could be similarly mapped out, and the student have put into his hand *Outlines of Theology*, in the shape of a hand-book not unworthy to form a companion volume to the present.



Dictionnaire de la Bible. Par Jean Augustin Bost. Deuxième Edition. Paris: Meyrueis.

Bibel Lexicon [Biblical Dictionary]. Edited by Dr. Daniel Schenkel. Vol. II. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Theologisches Universal Lexicon [Theological Dictionary]. 12 Parts. Elberfeld: Friederick.

THE first of these three works has been for some time well known and much valued among the Evangelical Protestants of France. It is a compilation from almost all available sources, but made by a pastor of the Christian Church who has no sympathy with modern change. The following sentence from the present edition will probably recommend the book to our French-loving theologians:—"We could not pass in silence the present theological and religious crisis. . . . But, without being bound either to reproduce or refute the numberless hypotheses that rise on all sides, the author has felt bound to prove all things in order to hold fast the good, as well in the publications of Strasburg as in those of Paris and Geneva."

As Dr. Schenkel's undertaking proceeds, we admire, more and more, its ability, precision, and tact; but feel more and more how pernicious is its submission to Rationalism on every vital subject. Were it thoroughly infidel, the public would know what to expect, and look at it only to see what our enemy says. But here are such names as Hitzig, Holtzmann, Lipsius, Reuss, Roskoff, Schweitzer: men who have written much and learnedly in the exposition and defence of what they regard, and regard with reverence, as the Divine religion of Christ. Two or three of these names, not to mention the editors, would be sufficient to attract many a reader, as they attracted us. What, then, must be the result of finding uncertainty thrown into every dogmatic statement, and confusion into every system of thought? We will give the reader the last sentence from the article on Inspiration, partly to show some German readers what this cheap and highly recommended work really is, and partly to show what one of the ablest investigators of the doctrine of Inspiration, Dr. Schenkel, is able to say about it:—

"The inspiration of Holy Scripture, in the usual acceptance of the word, must, therefore, be given up. This is a simple obligation of truthfulness and of conscientious sincerity: therefore, of Christian piety itself. But not on that account must the Bible be placed on the same level with other literary productions; it ever remains the one unique Book, the great Instructor and Consoler of Mankind. It is, in its original character, the Book of Religion, of the everlasting religion of the human race. The religious-moral life of humanity, and the history of its development, conflicts and victory, is reflected in it with amazing truth and freshness of colouring. The very spirit of religion itself has produced this volume, and therefore, of course, a Divine Spirit; but, indeed, the Spirit of God as it has been received and appropriated by the human spirit in many various measures of imperfection, and accord-

ing to a very various process of development. The Bible is the book of the primitive archives of historical saving revelation; its authors, so far as they are not mere collectors or transmitters, write under the consciousness that they were servants of the Divine historical revelation; hence the religious-moral enthusiasm which distinguishes them, the sacred zeal that animates them; hence, also, at the same time, the occasionally onesided and prejudiced standpoint from which they cannot remove themselves. It is easily understood that the historical interest, or historical fidelity, will recede very surely where the religious and the moral so mightily preponderate. As a rule, much more stress is laid by the writers of Scripture upon the religious and moral ideas with which their minds are filled than upon the external historical facts which they record or presuppose. The Holy Ghost, the spirit of religious and moral truth, exerted upon them assuredly a mighty influence; though He did not make them infallible, and did not compensate for, or neutralise, the defect of investigation where that may have been wanting. But this same spirit of truth, which is the spirit of Christianity itself, demands of us that we submit to no delusions as to the origin and the contents of the Bible; that we do not treat it and judge it according to the formulas of any dogmatic theory; but that we receive it as we find it, in the spirit of corresponding sincerity and truth-loving, and in the light of unbiassed historical criticism."

We cannot help thinking that a doctrine of inspiration which goes so far ought to go farther; or, rather, to ask whether it is not possible to remove, by deeper research, the obstacles which stand in the way of a doctrine more consistent with itself, and more adapted to the needs of the erring world, and more honourable to the character of the Moral Governor of mankind.

We cannot forbear from quoting the two sentences which open and close another article,—that on the Trinity,—for the sake of the illustration it furnishes of the same instinct of reluctance to give up the old truth; the same unconscious apology for its scepticism; the same enforced tribute to the grandeur of the truth:—

"The Church teaches that the Divine nature in itself is purely and simply a unity; but that this unity exists from eternity in three distinct persons, or *Ichheiten* (the immanent or intra-Divine tris-unity), and hence that He has historically revealed Himself by an everlasting internal necessity in three persons (Father, Son, and Spirit). The proof that such an assumption of a Divine triple personality does not disparage the unity of God is obligatory on the Church doctrine; hence it has appealed to the 'mystery' that lies in this dogma, and asserts that the understanding in the presence of that mystery must seal its eyes and surrender itself absolutely to faith. This, however, overlooks the fact that it is the function of 'revelation' to make clear and comprehensible the mysteries of religion, and not to make them obscure; and that a dogma which must decline to justify itself before the judgment-seat of reason cannot make any pretension to scientific establishment or acceptance. Therefore we have nothing whatever to do now with an

investigation of the scientific basis of the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity; but simply with the question how far this doctrine has any foundation in Scripture, and what right it has to trace its origin to the Bible."

This is plain speaking, and touches the very point of the objection to a doctrine which, in a glorious manner, pervades the Scripture. The part of the Bible in which its revelation excels in glory, where it shines almost without a cloud—the Gospel of St. John—is dismissed, (1) by an allegation of its unapostolical character; and (2) by a reference to the Alexandrian Logos-doctrine. Now, it ought to be remembered that the doctrine, after all, has not its leading dogmatic or formalistic support in St. John; and, secondly, that its exhibition by St. John is absolutely independent of his Logos-doctrine, being contained in that part of his Gospel which does not refer to the "Word." The article thus closes:—

"It is scientifically no longer possible to establish the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity from the Scripture. Every attempt of that kind must be rebuked by unbiassed historical exposition; that is, by the moral earnestness of investigation, by the spirit of truth and sincerity itself. But, granting this, Christianity thereby loses nothing but a stone of stumbling to thousands of religiously earnest and morally conscientious men, who cannot, by any means, reconcile themselves to the doctrine. Assuredly it cannot be denied that there lies, at the foundation of this doctrine, a profound necessity; otherwise it would not have occupied, for so many long centuries, so many profound intellects. Its truth lies in the mighty acknowledgment it makes of the unbounded livingness and communicability of God; in the consciousness that nothing less than the Divine Himself has been revealed to mankind through Christ; and in the confidence of man in the holy and eternal destiny of the Church, in which the Spirit of God and of Christ truly dwells, and, from generation to generation, is more and more livingly manifested, in order to be an infinite and effectual revelation-organ of the Divine life and of the Divine love."

Here is the purest spirit of Rationalism. It is not infidelity; it is not scepticism. Christianity is received with all its documents and ordinances. But all is brought under the cold, calm scrutiny of the reason; and that in spite of the express assertions and warnings of the very Scripture that is said to be given of God; which does not make any declaration more emphatic than this, that the Divine Being, who is the centre of a mysterious universe, is also the circumference of an infinite mystery within Himself. Having rejected the mystery because it is mystery, Rationalism here proceeds to examine the grounds of the mystery in its own way, and absolutely makes as great a demand upon its own credulity as it asserts the Church to have made upon that of its deluded votaries.

However, it is only right to observe before closing, that the spirit of this Rationalism, and of this volume as its best expositor, is not irreverent or flippant, like that of too much of the same school in

England. Whatever the subject discussed, it is never forgotten that the theological domain is, as such, holy ground.

Meanwhile the *Theologisches Universal Lexicon* goes on its way, side by side with its more ambitious compeer: learned, comprehensive (almost too comprehensive) and orthodox. Students of theology who read German should get this valuable Biblical Dictionary.

**Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, with special reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen School.** By George P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Scribner and Co. 1870.

A REPRINT, or rather a new and enlarged edition, of a work has been popular in the United States, and has done considerable service there. Many of the topics discussed are such as maintain their supreme importance through all the variations of controversy; some of them are ephemeral in their bearing, and scarcely demand preservation. The authenticity of St. John's Gospel, and the origin of the synoptical Gospels, occupy a large place in the volume; but more recent disquisitions are throwing so much new light on these subjects that no such general essays as these can long fairly represent the position of the question. The articles, also, on Renan and Strauss are obsolete. We would not say the same of those on Baur and the Tübingen School, which are among the best that have been published on the subject. The long series of sections on miracles, as a branch of Christian evidence, deserve careful attention: they leave no branch of the subject untouched, and almost exhaust the subject generally. The supplementary notes are, perhaps, the most valuable portion of the volume; the dignified caution and discernment they display may be estimated by the following extract on Positivism:—

"Comte, consistently with the fundamental principles of his system, was an avowed atheist. If final and efficient causes are set down as figments of the imagination, it is not to be expected that room will be found for an intelligent Creator. Mr. J. S. Mill states that it is open to a Positivist to believe or disbelieve in the existence of God, and that one's opinion on this point will be determined by the impression made on his mind by the analogies of design which present themselves in nature. His own opinion he does not express; but it is difficult to find, in his theory of causation, any warrant for assuming a Creator, or any sufficient answer to the objections brought by Hume against the argument from design. Herbert Spencer, adopting from Hamilton and Mansel the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, concludes that, although there is a first cause, that cause is utterly unknowable. We can form no conception of him or it, and must remain in absolute ignorance respecting its nature. This application of the doctrine of the relativity of our knowledge may well suggest caution in the enunciation of such a tenet. The phrase is capable of a meaning which

leaves untouched the foundations of knowledge and the truths of religion. But such is not the meaning which is commonly attached to it at present. The current doctrine amounts to this, that nothing is known as it is, but only as it appears to me, the knowing subject. This is equivalent to saying that mind cannot *know*, in the proper sense of the term; that knowing involves such a modification of the thing, that, in truth, we know not it; but the object of knowledge is something else which is more or less the creation of the knowing faculty. This is the doctrine charged by Plato on certain of the sophists. Kant, by laying it at the foundation of his theoretical system, organised scepticism, and paved the way for all the subsequent philosophies in which knowing is resolved into a process of being. Sir William Hamilton, notwithstanding his adoption of Reid's Natural Realism, and his distinction between the secondary and primary qualities of matter, becomes—inconsistently it would seem—an advocate of the relativity of knowledge, in the objectionable form of the doctrine. By his doctrine respecting the principle of causation, that it describes not a positive conviction, but a negative impotency, Hamilton brought another disturbing element into the sphere of natural theology. The mind, as far as its range of knowledge extends, knows things as they are—the *Ding an sich*; the necessity of belief is the criterion of reality; the principle of causation is an *à priori* positive conviction of the intelligence,—these are principles which must be avowed by a sound philosophy. When final causes are asserted, it is not meant that any or all of the last or ultimate ends for which the world exists can be discerned. It is quite conceivable that these may be hidden from our knowledge. But this is affirmed, that, wherever we turn our eyes, we discover an arrangement of means with reference to ends, adaptation, order, design.

“Philosophical theologians differ among themselves in their mode of conceiving of the argument from final causes. By some it is presented purely as an argument from analogy. Here, on every hand, are processes and products which have a striking resemblance to those which emanate from human contrivance. The eye, for example, is adapted to its office, as an optical instrument is to the use for which it is designed. If the latter exists through the agency of intelligence, which constructs it for a purpose, why not for the former? We instinctively ascribe the eye to an intelligent author. This instinctive recognition of design is universal among men.

“But what is here attributed to an instinct, is justly considered by other thinkers to be the operation of an intuitive principle. This principle is, that wherever there is order, the fitness of means to ends, there is presupposed an intelligent agent. Order implies intelligence. This intuitive truth is the major premise of the syllogism, of which the minor is the observed adaptations in man and in the world around us. So, for substance, the argument has been stated by Buffier and by numerous other philosophers. There is a union of an *à priori* conviction with observed facts.

"There are philosophers, however, who consider our belief in final causes to be strictly *à priori*, and on a level with the principle of efficient causation. They hold that our knowledge of no object is complete, the appetite for knowledge is not satisfied, until we ascertain, not merely what a thing is, and whence it is, but also what it is for. A belief in the reality of final causes underlies the operations of intelligence, as does a belief in efficient causes. This belief is not a product of experience, but precedes it. Its genesis is connected with the action of our own minds, as is the fact in regard to the principle of efficient causes. Both beliefs are suggested or awakened, both emerge into consciousness, on the condition of our mental operations, yet both are intuitive and necessary.

"Whatever special view is adopted, the validity of the proof, from final causes, remains unshaken. This proof is thought to be undermined by the substitution of the principle of the *conditions of existence*. This is declared to be 'the true positive transformation of the doctrine of final causes.' We are told that the fish is adapted to the sea only in the sense that without the sea the fish could not exist. The fish is the product of certain forces and conditions, among which the sea is included. The fact, however, is, that we find a concurrence of conditions 'proceeding from various and independent quarters;' and this it is which proves design.

"The human eye is fashioned, apart from the light, in the dark laboratory where it is 'made in secret.' This marvellous instrument does not owe its existence to the light, yet only as related to the light has it significance or value. Moreover, besides the bare existence of the objects of nature, there are multiform special provisions for beauty and for happiness. There are variations of structure which serve to accomplish particular ends beyond the mere existence and ordinary functions of the being."

This extract is inserted for our readers' benefit, in part; and in part to show how searching and how reasonable are Dr. Fisher's strictures on dangerous tendencies in theology and philosophy. The extract will also illustrate a rare excellence of many American authors, their carefulness to show the connection, very strict whether for good or for evil, between metaphysics and divinity. No writers have done so much as American divines to show the great advantage of soundly studying theological metaphysics or metaphysical theology. And Dr. Fisher deserves to be mentioned as a safe guide.

Zur Einführung in das Buch Daniel [The Book of Daniel].  
Von Dr. C. P. Caspari. Leipzig: Dörffling and Franke.

ONE of those valuable little volumes into which German orthodoxy knows how to condense the result of much reading, and of a careful appreciation of the need of the times. Taking the form of popular lectures, the little volume deals with almost every subject of importance for the understanding of the prophet Daniel, and of that sacred



battle-ground and holy cause of which his name is the watchword. The first section of fifty-seven pages is devoted to the "origin of the Book of Daniel." It presents to the reader a deeply interesting sketch of the history of Israel from the separation of the two kingdoms down to the time of Christ. As heathenism and its false gods seemed to triumph in the captivity of Israel, and its degradation in Babylon, so the Book of Daniel shows the triumph of the omnipotence and omniscience of Jehovah in opposition to heathenism. The revelations of God through Daniel were, indeed, most strange and wonderful; and it is the duty of the expositor to seek to ascertain and establish the special designs of Divine Providence in such marvellous events. Those designs were threefold: first, to vindicate His own insulted dignity; secondly, to show His care for the heathen themselves, and to prepare them for the coming redemption; and, thirdly, to help His dejected people, and save them from the extremity of despair. The author points out, with great force, that there were four great periods of miraculous intervention during Old Testament times, or rather before the Day of Pentecost: the time of Moses, the time of Elijah and Elisha, the time of Daniel, and the time of Christ. Of these he shows that the first and the third, the second and the fourth correspond. The peculiar distinction of the Danielic season of miracles is fairly, though only fairly, exhibited.

The second section deals with the life and character of Daniel. The notices in Ezekiel are examined; the parallel with Joseph is drawn out; but chiefly the narrative of the book itself is examined. The prophet's grandeur is set forth in a manner worthy of the subject; his sinlessness of external life, his unshaken fidelity, his heroic faith, his consummate love, his deep humility, his loyalty to his earthly king—are thrown into a noble picture, which is followed by a good account of his high endowments and pre-eminent destiny and work.

The third section, which is occupied with the substance and internal connection of the Book of Daniel, is the weakest part of the book. What it contains is very good; but it passes over much that requires, in these days, careful elucidation. The historical difficulties in chap. i., the Greek names of the musical instruments, the occasional use of the Chaldee, the stupendous miraculous interventions, and other matters of objection that ancient and modern criticism delight to urge against the book, are passed over far too lightly. On the other hand, his treatment of the relation and harmony between the historical and prophetic elements in the book is highly interesting and important. On the whole, we cannot but rejoice that we still have, in our own English, the very best commentaries and essays on Daniel. Dr. Caspari's essay we took up with the impression that it would be worthy of translation into English; but we lay it down with the feeling that it would not add anything to the knowledge Dr. Rule's book affords, whilst it is, of course, immeasurably behind Dr. Pusey's exhaustive and orthodox volume on Daniel.

**Meister Eckhart, der Mystiker [Master Eckhart, the Mystic : a Contribution to the History of Religious Speculation in Germany].** Von Ad. Lasson. Hertz : Berlin.

THE author of this volume is a true and honest enthusiast, and approaches his subject with every possible advantage. He regards Eckhart as the central spirit of all mysticism; combining in himself the best and noblest elements of mysticism as no other before or since has combined them. On the one hand, he touches the most profound scientific thinkers, while, on the other, his whole system is only the connected development of a few religious principles of the purest simplicity. We commend to our readers the introductory remarks on this subject, as also the sketch of this wonderful thinker's life.

The fundamental principle of Eckhart's doctrine may be said to be his view of the nature of the soul. Self-consciousness is the condition of all knowledge. The soul is the true being, and elevated above everything creaturely; in its finite manifestation, bound to certain organs, it exhibits its simple unity in a variety of methods of operation and powers. As such the soul is a kind of mediator between God and the creature. Sensible perceptions become thoughts, thoughts become knowledge, and then comes the abiding and tranquil contemplation of the absolute. Passing by, however, the abstruse and incomprehensible elaboration of Eckhart's system of the everlasting existence and creation of all things in God—a system to which German philosophy owes very much—we must occupy a page with that which is the supreme point in the whole, and that which gives it its deepest interest—the *union of the soul with God*. Sin has not quenched the spirit's longing for its Maker. What separates man from God is only the external and the unessential; in its essence it is already one with Him. Through our free-will, and through our thinking reason, we become conscious of this unity. If the soul only will, it is in possession of God. God can will or desire nothing but Himself; hence all His will is directed to turn all the finite towards Himself. Consequently, God's grace is universal and necessary. Free-will is a presupposition of the work of grace; but grace itself is altogether and throughout God's work in us. The first thing that grace effects in us is to make us lay aside that which we had not from nature, *our sins*, and also that which we have from nature, *self*; this is conversion, the first step to the kingdom of God. Forgiveness establishes fellowship with God; perfect separation from all that is finite, and all that is self, crowns the soul with its perfection. Man must absolutely die to all that is without, all that is of himself, yea, to God Himself so far as He is separate from the soul. The supreme operation of grace is reserved for the soul thus absolutely cut off from all things without; and that supreme operation is God Himself on the soul of man working as He works on Himself, eternally and infinitely. What, then, is this but the generation of His Son in the spirit of man? The soul

itself becomes the Son of God. A total change comes to man in the very elements of his being; soul and body are transfigured in God. Perfect freedom in perfect oneness with God!

This sublime principle was not by Eckhart perverted into Pantheism, or even the extreme of Quietism. In him it is pure, refreshing, and elevating. But it, not the less on that account, tinged with error the whole process of his theology. It makes the Atonement an internal reconciliation only—the birth, passion, and resurrection of Christ in the soul. It leaves no place for the operation of the Holy Spirit, whose sanctifying influences fashion the soul after the image of Christ, and who presents the perfect result to God. Hence, in common with every kind of mysticism, it dishonours the economical Trinity of redemption. Then, further, it tends to the disparagement of the external works of holiness. Starting with the noble principle that it is the character of the will which alone gives moral value to an act, Eckhart's mysticism goes on to insist that, as all external acts refer to creaturely things, and, therefore, come between God and the soul, they have no value save as transacted within the spirit where God is. All holiness is, therefore, the ever-new decision of the will to renounce self; and should be regarded rather as the rest of the soul recovering from outward impulses and disturbances than as its own activity. The transition from this to a state of passivity, which leaves God to work all in us, is very obvious. Yet Eckhart's passivity was the passivity of a vigorous and determined direction of the reason to the contemplation of God, as the one sole Object adequate to its eternal satisfaction. Moreover, his system does not forget the limitations of time, and the disadvantages of the soul's earthly condition. Perfect abandonment, perfect repose, and perfect fruition it reserves for heaven; and views in Christ's suffering self-abnegation and voluntary poverty the highest types of mortal excellence. And he never fails to inculcate, together with patience and poverty of spirit, love as the great impulse of life. Virtue is to be cultivated for itself, or rather as its own necessity. Nothing in his system of morality is common or profane; he is intolerant of any distinctions or divisions in duty; and knows nothing of rules of holiness as such.

Eckhart's relation to the Church of his day was, of course, a singular one. He speaks of its institutions with reverence; but they occupy a small place in his system. Acknowledging the infinite variety of revelation, and the inspiring Spirit in all, he deems the Scripture intelligible only to him who, like the Scripture, is filled with the Spirit; and makes all outward revelation subordinate to the internal vision of God. The discipline of the Church he regarded as adapted to a lower condition, out of which the spiritual man emerges. To him every Christian was his own priest. He does not take knowledge of the intercession of the saints; nor had he any special veneration for Mary. The sacraments he discussed in a scholastic manner. These, like prayer, he regarded as the earlier discipline of religion. The soul dead to desire, and separated in God, needs no prayer. To

him devotion was simply the abiding expression of oneness with the mind of God.

As to some particular Christian doctrines, Eckhart had his own independent thoughts; and some of his views were as far from the Scripture as they were from the dogmas of his Church. For instance, he regarded sin as a destitution of good, or even an imperfect good; the remaining in a state of selfhood. Original sin came through Adam, who fastened his eye with the delight of self in that for which he knew that God had made him, instead of on God Himself. On the fortieth day, after conception, God creates every individual soul, born as the child of the evil spirit. But sin is taken up into the great plan of God, and leads to good. As to the Person of Christ, Eckhart was at best a Nestorian; though he acknowledged the Redeemer to have become, through union with the Word, a perfect exemplar of human excellence. He strangely renounced the vicarious work of Christ, regarding Him only as a consummate pattern, through whose truth within the soul every regenerated person becomes what He was. The goal of human holiness is to become all that Christ became through union with the Word of God. Denying the physical pains of another world, he nevertheless held fast the terrible consequences of reprobation without hope in the case of all who turn away from the vision of God in this life.

These are but cursory notes. Some of our readers will feel an interest in them, and, perhaps, be induced to read the work itself. It may be confidently said that no man whose mind and heart are right with God will be able to read a page of the history of this fervent student of God and lover of Christ, without feeling his soul stirred within him. Observing his many errors, he will observe also that they all sprang from the exaggeration of the sublimest principle of our common religion.

**Studies in Church History.** By Henry C. Lea. Philadelphia : H. C. Lea. London : Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. 1870.

MR. HENRY C. LEA is a learned American writer. Two previous works of his have given us ample grounds for associating the qualification of learning with his name as an author. The first of these was, like the present work, a volume of essays. Under the title of *Superstition and Force*, it dealt with the Wager of Battle, the Wager of Law, the Ordeal, and Torture. Round these four subjects was grouped an immense amount of detail, which threw a clear and curious light on the cruel and legalised superstitions of the Middle Ages. The second work treated of the *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*. To the great learning and admirable impartiality of this book Mr. Lecky has done justice in his recent *History of European Morals*; and the last chapter of that work—the chapter, namely, which deals with the history of the position of women—is indebted to Mr. Lea's researches for some of its most important facts. "Since the great work of Dean

Milman," says Mr. Lecky, "I know no work in English which has thrown more light upon the moral condition of the Middle Ages, and none which is more fitted to dispel the gross illusions concerning that period which Positive writers, and writers of a certain ecclesiastical school, have conspired to sustain." Mr. Lea's historic monograph is indeed one of the most valuable works that America has yet produced.

The essays which are published in this volume are "Studies" on the Rise of the Temporal Power, Benefit of Clergy, and Excommunication. As the author points out, the first of these records the establishment of principles of which the subsequent development is traced in the succeeding essays; and throughout them all he has confined himself to points which illustrate the temporal aspect of ecclesiastical history, showing how the Church in meeting the successive crises of its career succeeded in establishing the absolute theocratic despotism which diverted it so strangely from its spiritual function. The subject of the first essay is one which has been receiving much attention of late. What distinguishes Mr. Lea here, as elsewhere, from many other writers in the same department is that his knowledge of the original authorities is not second-hand. The essay on Benefit of Clergy is interesting, though the shortest of the three. The one which follows, upon Excommunication, occupies some 250 pages, and seems to us to be the most valuable, for its admirable array of facts, such as few could collect and arrange in the same way. In all his works Mr. Lea confines himself to the statement of facts, and does not seek to draw conclusions from them as often as he might. This does not take away from the value of his books. He closes his last essay with the following remarks, which indicate the tone that marks some of his principal comments upon the events he narrates:—

"From this long history of oppression and wrong we may learn how easily the greed, the ambition, or the bigotry of man can convert to the worst purposes the most beneficent of creeds, and how unequal is our weak human nature to the exercise of irresponsible authority. Honest fanaticism and unscrupulous selfishness have vied with each other in using as a weapon for the subjugation of body and soul the brightest promises made by a benignant Saviour to His children; and every increase of power has been marked by an increase in its abuse. It is a saddening thought that a religion, so ennobling and so purifying in its essence, should have accomplished so little for humanity in this life, and that the ages in which it ruled the heart and intellect most completely should be those in which its influence was the least efficient for good and the most potential for evil. Its great central principles of love, and charity, and self-sacrifice seem ever to have found their most determined enemies in those who had assumed its ministry and had bound themselves to its service; and every conquest made by its spirit has been won against the earnest resistance of its special defenders. Even though the last two centuries have been marked by a development of true Christianity, still the old arrogance and uncharitableness exist. Indifferentism and irreligion are assumed to be the motives of men who

most earnestly strive to obey the laws of Christ; and it would scarce be safer now than in the thirteenth century to intrust temporal authority to those who claim to represent the Redeemer and His Apostles. There is much, then, to be done ere the precepts of the Gospel can truly be said to control the lives and the characters of men; and all who are earnest in the good work can derive from the errors and the follies of the past not only a noble zeal of indignation to nerve them afresh for the long struggle, but also hopeful encouragement for the future in measuring the progress of these latter days."

It will not be out of place for us, in this connection, to remark that in reading the writings of a certain school we have frequently to desire some definite statement in each case where they occur as to what is meant by the terms "Church" or "Christianity." Taken in a certain sense, the remarks are true of the "Church" or "Christianity;" taken in another, they are exaggerated, if not unfounded. The appeal to the "Church" is often made now for other ends than those of superstitious dogmatism; but in this case we have as much need to distinguish between the vitiated teaching of a human society and the essential ethics of Christ.

Among books of the class to which they belong, Mr. Lea's works deserve to obtain a very high place. They are books of solid worth, genuine "authorities" on the subjects discussed in them. To the student in this field of literature they are worth any number of books of the sort which is so common, based upon ill-digested stores of second-hand knowledge.

**Saving Knowledge.** Addressed to Young Men. By Thomas Guthrie, D.D., and W. G. Blaikie, D.D. 1870.

HERE are five addresses by Dr. Guthrie and seven by Dr. Blaikie. Dr. Guthrie's style, pictorial, eloquent, earnest, and impressive, might have been thought to be a sufficient signature to his addresses. We doubt, however, if we had not been told which was which, whether any could have been sure that the addresses written by Dr. Blaikie were not Dr. Guthrie's in his somewhat less glowing and closer style. The subjects are admirably selected and arranged:—"God's Verdict on Man;" "God's Sentence on Man;" "The Evil of Sin;" "Man's Inability to Save Himself;" "God's Gift to Man;" "The Saviour's Person;" "The Work and Glory of the Saviour;" "The Way of Salvation;" "The Sinner's Link to the Saviour—Faith;" "The Spirit of Life;" "Made Holy;" "The Sacraments." The doctrine is clear, sound, and well explained and applied.

**Filial Honour of God, by Confidence, Obedience, and Resignation.** With Appendices on the Reward of Grace, and on the Nature of the Cup of Gethsemane. By William Anderson, LL.D. Glasgow. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS is a full description of the contents of the book. Dr. Anderson will have none of the doctrine of merely disinterested virtue. Good



works are to be rewarded, and the reward is to be held forth as an incentive to good works.

Dr. Anderson's character as a writer will be known to those who have read his former works. He is, without question, an independent and vigorous thinker; but those who make his first acquaintance in the present volume will be ready to suggest that more patient thinking might possibly lead to a style less angular but not less forceful or impressive.

Histoire de l'Eglise [History of the Church]. Par J. A. Moehler. 3 Vols. Paris: Gaume Frères.

TO JOHN ADAM MOEHLER the Roman Catholic communion owes more of its progress in Germany during the present century than to any other. He was born in 1796, received a theological education in Tübingen, entered the priesthood, became Professor of Theology in the University of Munich in 1835. His erudition was profound, his piety sincere, and his zeal in the cause of his own Church unwavering. His writings were numerous: the best known being on *The Unity of the Church*, *Athanasius and his Times*, *Patrology*, *Discussion of the Doctrinal Differences between the Catholics and the Protestants*, and the *Symbolism*. This last was his most important production. It is a challenge thrown down to all the communions and confessions of Protestantism; and by far the ablest work of the kind since the time of Bossuet. Translated into many languages, it evoked replies from some of the most illustrious Lutherans, and hence was the indirect cause of a considerable stimulus to orthodox doctrine in Germany. We would recommend the student who desires to know thoroughly the dogmas of Rome, and the precise shades of truth which they oppose, and the best method of meeting them, to make himself familiar with Moehler's *Symbolik*, translated into English under the title of *Symbolism*, comparing it, as he goes, with the replies of Nitzsch and Baur.

The work mentioned at the head is one that has just reached our hands. It is posthumous; and, moreover, a French translation. But it has all the freshness of free lectures, and some of its chapters are peculiarly valuable in relation to present controversies. Moehler died at the age of forty-two, leaving amazing proofs of his genius and industry, and a character admired by all classes alike. He owed very much to Evangelical Protestantism, with which he was thoroughly familiar. And though a determined advocate of his own Church, he repaid the debt to some extent by stimulating his opponents to defend better their better cause. Döllinger, and most of the Bavarian Catholics, were formed by him, and cherish his memory with reverence.

Theologische Ethik [Theological Ethics]. Von Dr. Richard Rothe. 3 Vols. Second Edition. Wittenberg: Koelling.

WE can do little more than announce the new volume of Rothe's great work, and indicate its contents: an ample review would require

a long delay, as this is a work which requires much patient thought. This volume contains the three great departments of ethics, according to the distribution with which the earlier volumes have made us familiar: goodness, virtues, and duties. The treatment of these introduces an entire system of theology, at least so far as theology is concerned with sin, and redemption, and holiness. A more profound and suggestive volume could not be taken by any man into his hands; but after many efforts to understand it, we have found some parts incomprehensible.

The first part treats the Supreme Good in two sections: the former containing the doctrine of sin, and the latter that of redemption. Sin is viewed in its idea, in its origin, in its consequences. Redemption in its idea, preparations, accomplishment in the redeeming work, and continual manifestation in the Redeemer's kingdom. Two hundred pages are occupied with these subjects. The doctrines of morality are treated in like exhaustive manner; but the volume does not finish the analysis of the subject.

Harless' volume on "Christian Ethics," translated by Messrs. Clark, goes over the same ground, and in a much more intelligible and useful manner. It will not be superseded by Rothe's, at least in England, even supposing the phalanx of translators from the German who are in the service of the Foreign Theological Library contains a man bold enough to attack him.

**Vorträge und Abhandlungen geschichtlichen Inhalts** [Historical Lectures and Essays]. By Edward Zeller. Leipzig: L. W. Reissland.

THIS interesting volume contains twelve essays which represent the lighter work of Dr. Zeller, the learned historian and critic of ancient philosophy, and the latest representative of freethinking theology in the South of Germany. They are gracefully written, and much more easily read than most German writings. The first traces the growth of the monotheistic idea among the Greeks from the beginning down to its juncture with Christianity in Neoplatonism. The second investigates the traditions concerning Pythagoras and his doctrine. The third deals pleasantly with the traditions concerning Xantippe. The fourth traces the connection between Plato's Republic and later politics. The fifth is a complete sketch of Aurelius Antoninus. The sixth comes down to Wolff, and describes the contest between the new philosophy of Germany and the spirit of Pietism. The seventh is a memoir of Fichte; the eighth an enthusiastic eulogy of Schleiermacher. The ninth gives a popular view of the origin of Christianity after the Tübingen theory. The tenth epitomises the history of the Tübingen school itself; and the eleventh the history of its head, F. C. Baur. The last defends Strauss and Renan. The volume would be useful to those who prefer reading what men like Zeller themselves say to gathering all their knowledge of the new opinions from current report.

Here we have modern Rationalism popularised by one of its most eminent writers.

*Novum Testamentum Græce.* — Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit, apparatus criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit, commentationem isagogicam prætexuit Constantinus Tischendorf. Editio octava critica major. Voluminis II. Fasc. 1. Lipsiæ: Giesecke and Devrient.

THIS first instalment of the second volume of this work contains the Acts, the Epistle of James, the Epistles of Peter, and part of the First Epistle of John. We may expect, therefore, soon to have the final, or rather the latest, result of the great critic's long labours in two magnificent volumes. Meanwhile, it may be observed that the work is printed on good paper, and the page has not the crowded appearance which too commonly fatigues the eye in this class of works. Of course the critical apparatus still remains to all but the initiated a map of hieroglyphics. But those who have the key find that they unfold a most interesting history of every verse, and contain no small elements of profitable commentary. Some verses in the Acts, on which our eye has just been resting, have a most impressive exposition suggested by the mere history of the variations which they have undergone. May the Divine Hand be upon Dr. Tischendorf, and his labours, for many years to come!

*A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments.* Vol. VI. Acts—Romans. By the Rev. David Brown, D.D. 1 Corinthians—Revelation. By the Rev. A. R. Fausset, A.M. Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, and Co. 1870.

THIS is the sixth and last volume of the cheap, elegantly got up, and valuable Commentary which has been published through the enterprise of Messrs. Collins, of Glasgow. Dr. Jamieson and Mr. Fausset have done the Old Testament, Dr. Brown and Mr. Fausset the New. Dr. Brown's volume on the four Gospels is widely known, and is much prized, as we know, by many of our readers. We had hoped that the same accomplished expositor would have done the whole of the New Testament, thus furnishing a complete commentary on the Scriptures of the New Covenant from his pen. For one man, however, to write a commentary on the whole of the New Testament equal in care and merit to Dr. Brown's volume on the Gospels, is a task of great magnitude, and not to be accomplished without many months of reading and thought. Here, accordingly, we have only the Acts and the Romans from the hand of Professor Brown; the remainder of the volume, containing a commentary on all the Epistles except the Romans, and on the Revelation, being from the ready and competent pen of

Mr. Fausset, but less elaborate and less original than the portion contributed by the able divinity professor of Aberdeen. The Introductions to the different books are brief, and limited to what is essentially necessary to enable the reader intelligently and thoroughly to enter into the Commentary. Dr. Brown, however, has added to his Introduction a valuable *résumé*, exhibiting "the chief sources of authority for the text of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans."

This Commentary is one both for the intelligent but unlearned and for the learned student of Scripture. Dr. Brown has placed the strictly critical portions of his notes within brackets, and, although valuable and important even to the erudite student, they are as condensed as possible. In style and substance the notes are clear, vigorous, and sound. Dr. Brown's portion especially is of very high value. We doubt if we have in English so good a commentary on the Acts, or a better commentary on the Romans, than that which is given here.

The discussions of various readings furnished by Dr. Brown are, in certain cases, of no secondary importance. We may refer to the able and thorough discussions of the readings of Acts xx. 28; Rom. v. 1, viii. 1, and ix. 5.

Besides the current comments of Dr. Brown on the verses as they follow each other, one of the most instructive and valuable portions of his commentary in this volume, as in his volume on the Gospels, is the "Remarks" at the close of each chapter, which are by no means equivalent to the "Practical Observations" in improvement of the subject of the older commentaries, but are a sort of reserved ground for expatiating on all the most important thoughts suggested by the section commented on, whether apologetical, doctrinal, or experimental. Professor Brown has bestowed great pains on these "Remarks," and they are full of beauty, suggestiveness, and spiritual impressiveness. We may refer as samples of his work to the "Remarks" on the "Church of Antioch" (pp. 87, 88), on the "Extension of the Apostolate," pp. 101-3, and on the "Righteousness of God" (Rom. i. 17), p. 195.

**A Key to the Narrative of the Four Gospels.** By John Pilkington Norris, M.A., Canon of Bristol. Rivingtons. 1869.

THIS is a golden little volume. Having often to criticise unsparingly volumes published by Messrs. Rivington, and bearing the deep High-Church brand, it is the greater satisfaction to be able to commend this book so emphatically. Its design is exceedingly modest. Canon Norris writes, primarily, to help "younger students" in studying the Gospels. But this unpretending volume is one which all students may study with advantage. It is an admirable manual for those who take Bible-classes through the Gospels. Closely sifted in style, so that all is clear and weighty; full of unostentatious learning, and pregnant with suggestion; deeply reverent in spirit, and altogether Evangelical in spirit; Canon Norris' book supplies a real want, and ought to be welcomed by all earnest and devout students of the Holy Gospels.

**Fiji and the Fijians.** By Thomas Williams. And **Missionary Labours among the Cannibals; Extended, with Notices of Recent Events.** By James Calvert. Edited by George Stringer Rowe. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

WE hail the reappearance, in a cheaper form, of this unostentatious record of heroic Christian toil, sacrifice, and success. If any justification of Missionary zeal and liberality were needed, it could be readily supplied from the pages of this "Mission History." We know no similar work in which the struggles of Christian truth with heathen life is more graphically depicted, or the success of that truth more amply illustrated. For some time the book has been before the public; and it has been thoroughly appreciated. We have little need to characterise it. Long will it hold its place as a classic work on Christian Missions. A supplementary chapter has been added to former editions, containing interesting matter on the Theological College, native Missionaries, schools, the press and literature, the present state of the Mission, success and extraordinary liberality in the Friendly Islands, the American difficulty, &c.

Slowly the Church writes the chapters of her history; of that commenced some fifty years ago, this book furnishes one of the most brilliant pages. Slowly the Gospel is brought into contact with the various low forms of life and religious thought. Its adaptation to commingle with the wildest, rudest life, to exalt and purify that life, is here forcibly illustrated. And the rapid absorption of Christian truth into the life of heathenism, and the almost miraculous change wrought in it, bear striking testimony to Christianity as the true law of human life.

**The Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, regarded from a Layman's Point of View.** By Daniel Biddle, Author of "The Spirit Controversy," &c. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

A **THOUGHTFUL** and manly treatise on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to Evangelical Church of England principles. In a clear, thorough, and practical way, it deals with all the more important Scriptural words relating to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and illustrates their value and meaning. It is written with the belief that the two extremes of error rife in our day, Rationalism and Ritualism, must melt away before an honest interpretation of the two Sacraments ordained by Our Lord. This may appear a bold assumption. Certainly the Sacraments hold within themselves the very pith of the controversies. The bearing of the present work on the assumption of Romanism is clear; but its relation to the other form of error is not so obvious.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Lectures on Art. Delivered before the University of Oxford, in Hilary Term, 1870. By John Ruskin, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MR. RUSKIN'S appointment to the Slade Professorship of Fine Art has already produced good fruit. The lectures in this volume are, on the whole, exceedingly good. Errors they have, and the usual paradoxes are in them; but these will be innocuous. The healthy, bracing, educational influence of the volume will remain.

It is Mr. Ruskin's charm that his books are read with interest by many who care nothing about the attainment, for themselves, of any skill in art. His picturesque and nervous style does us good; and the lofty ideals, whether of morals or of taste, that he keeps before our minds cannot be contemplated without benefit.

The second lecture, on "The Relation of Art to Religion," deserves to be carefully read and pondered. It contains a very fine answer to the question, how far religion has been helped by art. It is true that, before we reach this subject, we have to encounter some flowing periods that give us the old, semi-heathenish, semi-sentimental account of the inspiration of art. Passing all this by as frivolous, and, where not frivolous, incomprehensible, we listen attentively to Mr. Ruskin's statement of the question between the simplicity of religion and the pictorial embellishments of Rome. Instead of discussing the subject, we will give a sentence or two of the lecturer's beautiful English:—

"The effect of this realistic art on the religious mind of Europe varies in scope more than any other art-power; for in its higher branches it touches the most sincere religious minds, affecting an earnest class of persons who cannot be reached by merely poetical design; while, in its lowest, it addresses itself not only to the most vulgar desires for religious excitement, but to the mere thirst for sensation of horror which characterises the uneducated orders of partially civilised countries; nor merely to the thirst for horror, but to the strange love of death, as such, which has sometimes, in Catholic countries, showed itself peculiarly by the endeavour to paint the images in the Chapels of the Sepulchre so as to look deceptively like corpses. The same morbid instinct has also affected the minds of many among the more imaginative and powerful artists with a feverish gloom which distorts their finest work. And lastly—and this is the worst of all its effects—it has occupied the sensibility of Christian women, universally, in lamenting the sufferings of Christ, instead of preventing those of His people.

"When any of you next go abroad, observe, and consider the meaning of, the sculptures and paintings which, of every rank in art, and in



every chapel and cathedral, and by every mountain-path, recall the horrors, and represent the agonies, of the Passion of Christ; and try to form some estimate of the efforts that have been made by the four arts of eloquence, music, painting, and sculpture, since the twelfth century, to wring out of the hearts of women the last drops of pity that could be excited for this merely physical agony, for the art nearly always dwells on the physical wounds or exhaustion chiefly, and degrades, far more than it animates, the conception of pain.

"Then try to conceive the quantity of time, and of excited and thrilling emotion, which have been wasted by the tender and delicate women of Christendom during these last six hundred years, in thus picturing to themselves, under the influence of such imagery, the bodily pain, long since passed, of One Person, which, so far as they indeed conceived it to be sustained by a Divine Nature, could not, for that reason, have been less endurable than the agonies of any simple human death by torture; and then try to estimate what might have been the better result, for the righteousness and felicity of mankind, if these same women had been taught the deep meaning of the last words that were ever spoken by their Master to those who had ministered to Him of their substance: 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.' If they had but been taught to measure with their pitiful thoughts the tortures of battle-fields; the slowly consuming plagues of death in the starving children, and wasted age, of the innumerable desolate those battles left;—nay, in our own life of peace, the agony of unnurtured, untaught, unhelped creatures, awaking at the grave's edge to know how they should have lived; and the worse pain of those whose existence, not the ceasing of it, is death; those to whom the cradle was a curse, and for whom the words they cannot hear, 'ashes to ashes,' are all that they have ever received of benediction. These,—you who would fain have wept at His feet, or stood by His cross,—then, you have always with you. Him you have not always."

This is followed by a fine protest against the attempt to localise the Divine presence in buildings made by hands. But, as usual, the recoil from error and superstition carries the lecturer, and those whom he sways, into an opposite error, equally pernicious: of the great difference between one place and another, of the power of the simple symbols of Christian fellowship, of the healthy influence exerted by pictures and representations of scenes that are not morbid, the lecturer says nothing. But his argument would have been strengthened had he done full justice to the other side of the question.

On the whole, we have no doubt that Mr. Ruskin's influence at Oxford will be a healthy one. His rhapsodies will never stop the mill-wheels, or quench the furnaces in the North, or bring back Old England to Arcadian simplicity; nor will he be the inaugurator of a new school of painting. But there is a dignity and nobility in his nature, and in his teaching a purity and earnestness, that cannot fail to appeal powerfully to the classes that listen to him.

Across America and Asia: Notes of a Five Years' Journey Around the World, and of Residence in Arizona, Japan, and China. By Raphael Pumpelly, Professor in Harvard University, and sometime Mining Engineer in the Service of the Chinese and Japanese Governments. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. 1870.

THIS closely printed volume of some 450 pages contains an immense amount of matter. The design of the author has been to give in it a narrative of a journey which encircled the earth in the northern temperate zone, at a time of unusual interest in several of the countries visited. The strictly scientific results of his observations have been published in a previous volume, issued by the Smithsonian Institution under the title of *Geological Researches in China, Mongolia, and Japan*.

Mr. Pumpelly went to Arizona in the autumn of 1860, to take charge for a year of the silver mines of Santa Rita as mining-engineer. His description of the state of affairs at that time in the territory of Arizona reveals to us very clearly the social disorganisation of a border state in which the restraints upon evildoers were of the most rudimentary kind. Speaking of one notorious ruffian who was at one time employed at the Santa Rita mines, our author remarks: "One cannot come much in contact with such men without feeling how little human nature has been affected by the march of society, and how subject to conventional influences are even the passions of man. The workings of conscience come to seem a refinement of civilisation, but so artificial that they are absent in the absence of the restraints of the civilisation in which they originate. An eminent clergyman has said that colonisation is essentially barbarous; certainly, from the time when the pioneer first enters a new country, until, with increasing population, the growing interests of individuals and society necessitate the bridling of crime, the standard of right and wrong is far below that even of many peoples whom we class as savages. And, other things being equal, it is by the lesser or greater rapidity of this transformation process that we may measure the superiority or inferiority of the parent civilisation." Before the year had elapsed, after the incursions of the Indians and the treachery of the Mexican peons had made it impossible to carry on the working of the mines, and after the superintendent and others of his friends had been murdered, Mr. Pumpelly made his way out of the country. His journey across the Colorado desert to South California is vividly described.

At San Francisco Mr. Pumpelly was appointed by the agent of the Japanese Government to accompany another American geologist and mining engineer in an exploring expedition through a part of the Japanese empire. For this post he had been recommended at the same time by the United States Government at Washington and at San Francisco. As we do not intend to follow him in his long-continued journeys, we may here briefly remark, that by the Governments of both

China and Japan he was appointed to investigate the mineral wealth of their respective countries, and especially the possible coal supply. His book owes much of its value to the peculiar advantages which he possessed, and which he knew how to use, from his official position in these two exclusive countries.

Professor Pumpelly is a good observer. Shrewd, clear-sighted, and open-minded, his remarks on the men and things which he has seen are very valuable. He seems to be singularly free from the too common fault of looking at the people of other lands from the outside only. He has a considerable capacity for sympathising with men of other customs and modes of thought than his own. And while his observations on men and manners are improved by this, his scientific training and the especial objects of his journeys make his remarks upon the physical features of different countries well worth reading. While the purely scientific results of his travels have been already given in the book before referred to, yet he has not excluded from this volume anything of this kind which was needed to make his descriptions complete. The reader of his book will find it to be more full of trustworthy information in a condensed form than most books of travel which he will come across.

Of the conduct of foreigners in China, Mr. Pumpelly, in several places, speaks in terms of grave reprobation; and he gives ample justification for his remarks. As to international policy, he agrees with his friend, the late Mr. Anson Burlingame, at whose house in Peking he resided for several months. His remarks upon American and Chinese politics are well worth attention. On one important point with reference to the population of China our author remarks: "With all the admiration a careful observer must have for China, it is certainly not a pleasant country for a foreigner to live in, unless he recognise and keep always before him the fact that organic matter, in decaying and giving nutriment to plants, loses every vestige of its former character. There is too much of the human element; go where you will, look where you will, it is there. In the more closely peopled parts the traveller is surrounded by a turbid stream of life, while he treads a soil almost human, the ashes of the unnumbered millions of the past; the very dust which he breathes and swallows is that of a charnel-house. The water of wells is everywhere impregnated with the products of organic decay, and the rivers are the sewers of countless cities. On the densely peopled plain all the organic, and much of the mineral, ingredients of the soil must have made many times the circuit of plant and animal life; in other words, everything that goes to make and maintain the human body has formed part of human bodies which have passed away. Few foreigners have the courage to enter the larger southern towns in summer, so horrible is the air. In the neighbourhood of great cities on the Delta plain, where water is found just below the surface, one may ride for miles always in sight of coffins bursting in the scorching heat of the sun, and breeding the pestilence that yearly sweeps off the surplus population."

We must not omit to notice the interesting chapter on Japanese Art, contributed by the author's friend, Mr. John La Farge; and the closing chapters which narrate the journey across the table-land of Central Asia, and through Siberia to Europe. Among recent books of travel Mr. Pumpelly's is worthy of very careful notice.

**The Epigrammatists; a Selection from the Epigrammatic Literature of Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern Times. With Notes, Observations, Illustrations, and an Introduction. By the Rev. Henry Philip Dodd, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy. 1870.**

It is impossible for a collection of this kind to deserve the praise of completeness in the sense of exhaustiveness. But Mr. Dodd's volume may be taken as giving a fair and full representation of epigrammatic literature in the principal fields, if not in all. And as a collection of epigrams, its value is greatly increased by the copious notes and apt illustrations from parallel passages which he furnishes. It is a very handy and useful volume, and must represent no small care on the part of the compiler. His work has been done with great good taste and discretion.

**Agatha. By George Eliot in *Atlantic Monthly*, August 1869.**

THE poem entitled "Agatha," contributed by George Eliot to the *Atlantic Monthly* for August 1869, had the misfortune to fall into pages with no very wide circulation this side of the Atlantic; and we could scarcely now take notice of the work had it been duly noticed by English critics at the time of its issue. It is to be regretted that the poem is so little known here, for, like other works of the author, it is full of a particular broad thoughtfulness which no head but one could have embodied in a work of literary art. "Agatha" is in form a sketch of nature and life from the Black Forest district. We are invited, in the prelude, to accompany the poet—

"To the mountain, not where rocks  
Soar harsh above the troops of hurrying pines,  
But where the earth spreads soft and rounded breasts  
To feed her children;"

and we are then introduced to the lowly cottage where poor old Agatha, the helpful handmaiden of fellow-villagers in general, lives and gives a home to two poorer cousins, the interior of this cottage being placed before us with a Dutch perfection of detail, whereof the precise analogue is to be found almost anywhere in the novels of George Eliot, but not elsewhere. The "Countess Linda" is presented to us—a young countess who comes to visit the old maid; and then follows a dialogue, of beautiful simplicity, which is yet full of noble thought, skilfully placed for the most part in the mouth of the simple old

woman. In sketching the outer and inner life of an aged maiden, typical, like Agatha, of a large class, the artist but follows that delicate and lofty instinct which has led her once and again to aggrandise and "prove illustrious" all life that is pure, even though lowly, and all work that is nobly done, however ignoble the intrinsic quality; but in this poem there is yet more, for the religion of the peasantry is woven with a dainty though firm hand into the fabric of the whole piece; and we are made to feel, as we have been more recently by the descriptions of the Ober Ammergau Passion Play, how vital the mediæval form of faith still is among certain contemporaries, who adhere closely and in all simple-mindedness, not to its gorgeous ritual and its elaborate dogmas, but to all the most human of its traits. The completeness with which a broad and lofty intelligence, holding all great ideas in full light, and comprehending the essences of religions, can sink itself so as to find the terms wherein such and such grand facts and thoughts would suggest themselves to a soul of primitive simplicity, is strikingly exemplified in several passages of this poem, and notably in Agatha's description of the effect her pilgrimage had on her in enlarging her idea of antecedent time:—

"The time! the time! It never seemed far back,  
Only to father's father and his kin  
That lived before him. But the time stretched out  
After that pilgrimage: I seemed to see  
Far back, and yet I knew time lay behind,  
As there are countries lying still behind  
The highest mountains, there in Switzerland.  
O, it is great to go on pilgrimage!"

The same tender care for Christian legend and history which the artist shows, in her prelude, in embalming the sweet story of the Magdalen, by a comparison of Countess Linda's hair to

"Hers who made the wavy lengths once speak  
The grateful worship of a rescued soul,"

is shown also in the dialogue in various Catholic ideas, well-selected for their humanness from among the multiplicity, and again in a lyric which closes the piece, and is described as a song *growing from out the life of the peasantry*. Agatha's reasons for and against praying are very characteristic:—

"Oft I think my prayers  
Are foolish, feeble things; for Christ is good  
Whether I pray or not,—the Virgin's heart  
Is kinder far than mine; and then I stop  
And feel I can do nought towards helping men,  
Till out it comes, like tears that will not hold,  
And I must pray again for all the world."

And almost more beautiful is the simple aspiration and trust of her reply to the Countess's doubt whether the poor old lady's sins can be very heavy—

"Nay, but they may be greater than I know ;  
 'Tis but dim light I see by. So I try  
 All ways I know of to be cleansed and pure.  
 I would not sink where evil spirits are.  
 There's perfect goodness somewhere ; so I strive."

But the piece rises to an artistic climax in the terminal song, whose burden of " quaintly mingled mirth and piety " is spread over its ten stanzas with perfect grace, covering much weighty thought. Through all its choric outbreathings to saints, this song shows that power which George Eliot possesses in so exceptional a measure, to grasp the essentially human element of an idea ; and whether we read—

"Holy Babe, our God and Brother,  
 Bind us fast to one another !"

or,

"Good St. Joseph, faithful spouse,  
 Help us all to keep our vows !"

the same thought will assert itself that the old faith remains vital yet, by virtue of its human essences, among men and women who have had no opportunity to climb to a higher, more intellectually founded, and more demonstrable form of religion. Such attempts as that so successfully made in this little poem—to present acceptably to all classes pictures of living belief—active, and active for good in the life of the individual—lie beyond the limits of weak contemporary praise, and to speak worthily of them is the heritage of a later generation.

Purpose and Passion : being *Pygmalion*, and other Poems.  
 By Keningale Robert Cook, B.A. London : Virtue and  
 Co. 1870.

JUDGED as an ultimate production, this book would be difficult to place in any distinct position as a contribution to our poetic literature. None of those poems which are considerable, in respect of length, are without many grave faults ; and, indeed, not one of the larger pieces can in any sense take rank as a contribution. But the volume, though put forth with all the *éclat* of a sumptuous get-up, does not challenge criticism from this point of view, being published as a "prentice work," or work of acknowledged immaturity ; and it claims consideration rather on the ground that there are some few lesser poems, some scattered passages, and certain discernible features of mind, that indicate a vein of poetic capacity, and promise a speedier or tardier repentance of much committed in publishing the book as it now stands. Mr. Cook shows a greater share of feeling and imagination of the poetic order than we should allot to that mystic being the "average man" of cultivation ; and he shows a certain sense of responsibility that endorses the promise of development in the line of work which he has assumed ; but in such immature work it is not easy to say whether a responsible air arises from a genuine source, or



from mere self-conceit, and on this nice point we hazard no opinion. The title, "Purpose and Passion," is exceedingly ill-chosen, for the book has no very salient purpose in it except the author's purpose to be in print, while real deep passion is not to be found on any one delicate little quarto page between these elegant "boards of green cloth." However, the song "Fairyland" (p. 280) has a ring of music, and is sufficiently dainty for purposes of enjoyment. The lines to a "Dying King" (p. 268) are fair as couplet writing, and more than fair for general expression, while furnishing a genuine sample of fervent didactic allegory. "A Study of Sunlight" (p. 103) and "A Study of Moonlight" (p. 105) are two poems of considerable descriptive and technical excellence; and the former is especially well felt. The metre of these two poems (hendecasyllabics) is particularly difficult for Englishmen to handle, and the skill shown by Mr. Cook in handling it gives much technical promise. These two samples of the metre are better than the attempt to write hendecasyllabics made in the "Ivory Gate" by Mr. Mortimer Collins (who, be it borne in mind, has written very charming verses), but will not stand beside the Laureate's Experiment, or even Mr. Swinburne's "In the Month of the long decline of Roses." For the rest, Mr. Cook needs to leave assimilating his contemporaries for the fearless cultivation of his own originality; and, doing this, we doubt not he may attain to do well.

Social Politics in Great Britain and Ireland. By Professor Kirk. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1870.

Those who know Mr. Kirk (who is Professor of Theology in the Morisonian College, Edinburgh) know that he is a very clear-headed and able man, and an excellent writer. In this book many truths of social and political economy are set forth with singular force. The great specialty of the volume, however, is its advocacy of prohibition in respect of intoxicating liquors. He would absolutely suppress the manufacture, the import, and the sale of liquor. Mr. Kirk is a logician; but the science of administration and the principles of government, where the citizens and the administration of such a country of freedom and individuality as England are in question, are evidently no part of Mr. Kirk's sub-conscious intelligence. In using such language we speak to Mr. Kirk himself, as a metaphysician and philosopher. How widely even so able a man may err when he writes as a mere logical theorist, and in favour of a foregone conclusion, will be seen from one sentence. "Smuggling," he says, "is next to obsolete now, because it is so highly the interest of rulers in this country to suppress it." On the contrary, it flourished most when it was most the interest of the rulers to suppress, and when it cost the nation almost an army and navy to keep it down. And it is almost extinct now, because it is not worth anyone's while to run even a slight risk in smuggling, when there is scarcely any duty on imports left.

The Immortals; or, Glimpses of Paradise. A Poem. By Nicholas Michell, Author of "Ruins of Many Lands," "Sybil of Cornwall," &c. London: William Tegg. 1870.

MR. MICHELL has the ear, the fancy, the fervour, and the facility of the genuine poet. His poetry always glows with feeling, and is full of descriptive beauty. We do not, however, agree with his metaphysics; and we mark a want of that solid and high intellectual discipline and culture without which it is impossible for any man to become a poet of the first class. In this poem Mr. Michell ranges "fancy-free" from orb to orb throughout the planetary and stellar spaces, and among their "human" inhabitants.

Poems. By Thornton Wells. London: Longmans. 1869.

WE extract from this volume one sonnet, because it does honour to a humble, but good and gifted man, to whom honour is due.

"WRITTEN IN A COPY OF THE POEMS OF JOHN HARRIS.

"Illustrious sons, not few have sprung from thee,  
My county! heath-clad Cornwall in the West:  
And for their sake the love which in my breast  
I bear the spot where played my infancy,  
Where friends yet dwelt, and others tranquilly,  
Life's tumult o'er, in sacred precincts rest,  
Is so enhanced, it may not be exprest  
By the poor art of verse acquired by me.  
Nor with thy choicest sons to rank unmeet  
Is he whose tuneful lyre resounds the praise  
Of 'Mine, and Moor, and Mount,' in sweetest lays;  
That lyre oft waked within the mine's retreat;  
And reverently my spirit now essays  
Harris, Cornubia's favourite bard, to greet."

Sacred Lays. By O. D. London: F. Bowyer Kitto. 1870.

THIS is a good book of its class. A number of the "lays" are excellently adapted for Sunday-school use, and have the advantage of being in good taste. Others happily express Christian experience and Christian aspirations.

Rural and City Life; or, The Fortunes of the Stubble Family. By Old Boomerang, Author of "Australian Capers," &c., &c. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1870.

OLD BOOMERANG writes dialogue very well, and has a great command of humour and of all that belongs to homely life. His scenes are laid in the Australian colonies, and his characters smack of bush raciness, or of Irish nature, or of the fast city life of New South Wales and of the Southern Australian colonies. His purpose, as a writer, is excellent; a high-principled Christian tone prevails throughout his writing. We could wish, indeed, that he were sometimes less effusive in his

moralising and preaching ; and that there were fewer sins and tragedies of fast colonial life woven into his story. But the writer has large resources and superior gifts. The name of Mr. Alexander Macarthur, on the page of dedication, is a guarantee for the character and good faith of *Old Boomerang*. To those interested in the colonies this volume will have special interest.

**Irma.** A Tale of Hungarian Life. By Count Charles Vetter Du Lys. Two Vols. London: Strahan & Co. 1870.

THE special interest of this story consists in its Hungarian life and colourings. This lends a certain novelty and piquancy to a quiet country story.

**Clinical Lectures, with Observations on Practical Medicine.** By Sir Henry Marsh, M.D., M.R.I.A., Bart. Edited by J. Stannus Hughes, M.D., F.R.C.S.I. Dublin: Moffatt & Co. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

THE high position held by the late Sir Henry Marsh will be a sufficient guarantee for the intrinsic value of these Lectures, whilst the fact that they have been reproduced from shorthand notes taken on the spot by the editor will give assurance of their accuracy. They have been published previously, but now appear in a cheaper edition.

**Passages from the English Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne.** Two Vols. Strahan and Co. 1870.

**The Americans at Home.** Pen-and-Ink Sketches of American Men, Manners, and Institutions. By David Macrae. In Two Vols. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1870.

HERE are two works which it would be well that every Englishman, if not also every American, should read. Mr. Hawthorne's Note-Books give you his intimate impressions about England and the English ; Mr. Macrae's Sketches give his account of "the Americans at home." The first work is from the pen of a sensitive, cultivated, critical American, a man of letters and of genius, a novelist of true poetical temperament ; by no means narrow, but confessedly prejudiced very deeply against many points, real or supposed, in the character and institutions of the English nation, and nourishing a rooted and even bitter jealousy of England itself, at the same time able keenly to appreciate the attractions of English antiquities, the deep interest of the historical scenes and monuments of the country, the beauties of English scenery, the refinement and culture of the best English society. In the other work we have the careful notes and descriptions of a thoroughly well-informed, intelligent, and unprejudiced Scotchman ; a Protestant Briton of the most cosmopolitan candour and enlargement of view, of the broadest Christian catholicity of feeling, who carries with him into America no English narrowness of prejudice, but views everything in a

spirit at once dispassionate and sympathetic; who, although not concealing his own approval of the Northern cause in the great American struggle, does the most ample and generous justice to the difficulties and necessities, to the patriotism and bravery of the South in that struggle, and who, in particular, celebrates the genius and devotion of the noblest among the Southern leaders almost as if he were a Southern man himself. In a word, we have in these two volumes of Mr. Macrae's the most truly intelligent, thoroughly sympathetic, and altogether trustworthy account of "The Americans at Home" that we have met with. The book is absolutely honest and authentic; a most wholesome, excellent book. It is true that Mr. Macrae has faults to reveal, but there is nothing carping in his tone when he has to speak of them; nor is there the least taint of national satisfaction in the manner in which he refers to American defects, whether in the social or political characteristics of the country. He praises heartily; he sympathises generously; he indicates faults delicately and with conscientious carefulness of statement. Perhaps such candour as Mr. Macrae's is not so remarkable in a Scotchman as it would be in an Englishman; Scotchmen, as a rule, are more cosmopolitan than Englishmen. Their own prejudices are mostly either distinctively Presbyterian or anti-English. The prejudices of properly English nationalism they hardly share. Their connections, too, are widely foreign, *i.e.* continental, colonial, and American. Mr. Macrae, besides, whilst the son, as it would seem, of a Presbyterian minister, is of Gaelic race, and has a sub-clan of fellow-clansmen settled in North Carolina; so that he was favourably circumstanced for impartiality of feeling in judging of the States and their inhabitants. He visited widely among North, South, and West.

Englishmen may learn much from a candid reading of the acute, if somewhat querulous criticism of Nathaniel Hawthorne. There is one peculiarity about his notes which must be always borne in mind. They were never intended for publication, and they represent his impressions frankly put down only for his own reperusal and consideration from day to day. In these notes he talks to himself, and does not too carefully ponder the expression of what he seems for the moment to feel. His often changeful thoughts are set down here just as they are shaping themselves. To-day he speaks and feels in one mood; to-morrow his judgment and opinions have already begun to change colour; in twelve months to come we may find that his views have been altogether transformed. This gives a peculiar interest and value to these notes. It is given us here to observe and study the very process by which experience enlarges the ideas, corrects the judgment, settles the opinions of a man of most mobile and impressible mental character. The first entry in the Notes is "Liverpool, August 4th, 1853." Mr. Hawthorne at that date entered upon the duties of his appointment as American Consul at Liverpool. The last date is "January 3rd, 1858." His consulship had terminated, and he was leaving England for the Continent. During the period included between these dates, the Crimean

War began and ended. It will be remembered that the relations between our country and the United States were, during this period, far from satisfactory, and that the sympathies of the States went largely with Russia in that war.

Many of Mr. Hawthorne's criticisms of English ways are as just as they are keen. We hardly know a book from which a teachable Englishman may be better instructed as to the real national defects of his country people. At the same time, it is interesting and satisfactory to observe how, in the course of four or five years' familiar residence among us, many of his first ill-informed or hasty judgments were reversed. He thought much better at the end than at the beginning of our people, our manners, our climate, even our institutions. At first no words could be too strong in which to condemn our climate in particular; but, at last, he has discovered that our climate, at its best, is the finest climate in the world, and that, taking the year through, we have, in England, our fair share of good weather and enjoyable days. Our ancient cities, such as Chester and York, our ancient castles and our cathedrals, are a passion to him. He revels in the scenery of our island, especially (as may be imagined) Wales, the English lakes, and Scotland; its all but universal beauty he fully appreciates. His notes on the Art Treasures' Exhibition, at Manchester, are very pleasant and instructive, showing, as they do, the perfect truthfulness to himself, the transparent intellectual sincerity of the writer, and the process of self-culture. The book, in a word, is full of instruction. It is no ordinary advantage for an Englishman to be admitted, as he is in these volumes, to the intimate and unreserved confidences of such a man as Nathaniel Hawthorne, during his four years' residence in England, as to all things English. At the same time we cannot but deeply lament the soreness, and jealousy, and prejudice against England so clearly revealed in this book, and which, although greatly mitigated, were not altogether removed even by his four years' experience of English courtesy and distinguished attentions. If such a man as Hawthorne was so deeply prejudiced, what must have been the case with narrower, less cultivated, and more bitter men!

Mr. Macrae's volumes are made up of most interesting and quotable matter; but we have no space for quotation. Canada, Upper and Lower, Protestant and Roman Catholic, "Young America," American women and the social questions with which the dearth and the position of "helps," and the duties of maternity, are connected, especially in the North-Eastern States; New York and Ward Beecher, the Christian Commission and its Chief, Philadelphia and Washington, Grant and the War, Richmond and the Past and Present of the South, "Beast" Butler, Petersburg and its Memories, Stonewall Jackson, "Lexington in the Valley," the American Missionary Association, and the Mission Home among the Freedmen, the Confederate Navy and Cavalry, North Carolina and her Sons, the Highlanders in North Carolina and Sherman's "Bummers," the Palmetto State, the peculiarities of Southern Society, the Emancipation which has been brought to the Whites by

Negro Emancipation, the Political Capacity and Influence of the Negroes, Negro Peculiarities and "Black Christianity," Admiral Semmes, New Orleans, the Mississippi, the Western States, Harvard and her two Humorists, Wendell Phillips, Emerson, Boston, and New England, John B. Gough, Drinking Habits and Liquor Laws, Americanisms, the Shakers, Newspapers, Churches, and Free Schools—these are among the topics dealt with in the two admirable volumes under our notice. Perhaps the author has included somewhat too much in his outline. But the writing is close and careful. As is usual with travellers in America, the account of national education is the most defective. The North-Eastern States have been taken as a sample of the whole country. The glaring defects of the State systems and the common schools, in many parts of the country, are left unnoticed.

**Personal Recollections of English Engineers, and of the Introduction of the Railway System into the United Kingdom.** By a Civil Engineer, Author of "The Trinity of Italy." London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE present comparative pause in the extension of British railways, which seems to mark something like the close of a final chapter in this part of the social history of our nation, imparts an especial timeliness to this volume. It mainly consists of reminiscences of scenes, persons, and transactions with which the writer was more or less closely and personally associated, and which date back to the laying out of the London and Birmingham line,—that first of the greater railway undertakings. Written in a clear and sprightly style by one who may claim to be a veteran among engineers, the book forms an interesting and instructive supplement to the more historical volumes of Mr. Smiles. The prejudices, difficulties, and hostilities encountered by the earlier surveyors and contractors, and the wit and energy with which these were disregarded or overcome, are shown in descriptions which vividly remind us what changes and advances have been made during the active life of the generation now rapidly passing away. With a few exceptions, the names of localities and persons depicted are not mentioned; a precaution in favour of the feelings of possible survivors not needless,—for "recollections," racy enough to read, may be such as neither the subject nor his friends would prefer to find embalmed.

—The engineers of whom the book tells the most are, not unnaturally, Robert Stephenson and Isambard K. Brunel. The cause of the breakdown of Stephenson's bridge across the Dee, at Chester, and circumstances connected with the official investigation of that disaster, are given at length in an attractive chapter. With Brunel, however, the writer was more closely acquainted, and we are especially indebted to him for his contribution towards a correct estimate of the character and abilities of the engineer of the Great Western Railway and the designer of the Great Western and Great Eastern steamships. Of "the imperfections in the character of Mr. Brunel," he says:—



"They were of the heroic order. He would have been, commercially speaking, a more successful engineer, had he possessed a less original and fertile genius. His untiring and insatiable industry wore out his iron frame prematurely as to years, though late if measured by accomplished work. His conscientious resolve to see with his own eyes, and to order with his own lips, every item of detail entrusted to his responsibility, brought on him an enormous amount of labour, which, on another and a more easy system, would have been borne by subordinates, perhaps with equal advantage to the public. His exquisite taste, his perfect knowledge what good work should be, and his resolve that his works should be no way short of the best, led rather to the increased cost, than to the augmented durability of much that he designed and carried out. His boundless fertility of invention, and his refusal to be content with what was good, if he saw beyond it what was better, led often to disproportionate outlay."—Pp. 200, 201.

By what mental process he was accustomed to detect and decide on what was best to be done in difficult cases is well shown in the following anecdote:—

"A slip had taken place in some marine works at Heyland, which Mr. Brunel had been down to examine. After looking at the spot with minute attention, waiting for the ebb of the tide, proving the sand, and taking every possible means to ascertain the actual facts, Mr. Brunel left the spot, and maintained silence for a considerable time. At last he spoke like a man waking out of sleep, gave a few plain and precise directions, and ordered a minute report to be preserved of the mode in which they were carried out. It was asked, not as a matter of professional direction, but as a question of intellectual interest, how he had come to the conclusion. 'All the time that we have been travelling,' he replied, 'I have been trying to fancy myself under the sand, and at the foundation of that wall. I have been trying to realise the scene, and to make up my mind as to what was actually taking place down there. At last I seemed to see it plain; it was easy then to order what to do, and now you will see whether I am right or wrong.' It will not be doubted that the insight thus obtained was mechanically true, and that the method employed was successful."—Pp. 269-270.

The "recollections" given are not limited to railway engineers and contractors. The narration of a simple but effectual expedient, by which a belt of bog, at the side of the Chelt, was made to carry the line of railway, leads to the mention of Macadam and his work, and to the "record of words that fell from the lips" of his son, Sir James, "during a night's *tête-à-tête* in the Manchester mail."

"Mr. Macadam, on retiring from commercial life, took up his abode in the vicinity of Bristol. He was soon placed on the list of county magistrates. During his former residence in Scotland, he had indulged in a hobby as to road-making. The highways of the country, at that time, were in a state which can only be termed infamous. In some rare cases, the mail route was paved, but, as a rule, the roads

were in the condition of those country tracks or drives which have never been metalled, as it is now termed—that is, which consist of bare earth. With every shower the wheels cut deep into the unprotected subsoil. The roads became a series of miry ruts, crossing one another in every form of tangle. The guard of the Royal Mail, on seeing a waggon ahead, used to blow his horn to warn the waggoner to draw aside out of his rut.

“In some particularly bad places large stones might be flung in to give a bottom to the artificial bog, but here, as everywhere else, the weather and the traffic were too much for the surveyor; and it was regarded to be as impossible to make good travelling in the winter as to sail against wind and tide. In fact, the theory of a perfect road was one which, from the expense which it involved, would have confined serious road-making to metropolitan districts. It was that the road must be built. It was to be a species of arch, resting on skew-backs or abutments, and thus relieving the underlying ground from the weight of the traffic. . . .”

It was against this theory, false in itself, and having the infallible result of rendering country road-making impossible, that Macadam waged war. “Keep the earth dry, and it will bear any weight that you can put upon four wheels!” And the simplest mode of keeping the earth dry, and preventing the formation of ruts, in which water invariably lodges, is to use small broken stone. A long series of experiments led the reformer constantly to diminish the size of the stone he recommended for metal. Flint or lime-stone, still better serpentine, granite, or hard trap-rock, broken into small cubes that would pass through a ring of three inches in diameter, was the material preferred by Mr. Macadam. Not that a cube of this dimension was in the state in which it formed the road. A further process of comminution had to be gone through, and, theoretically, the hammer of the road-maker should have continued the work. But, in practice, it was more easy to leave this final work to be performed by the wheels of the carriages using the road; the crushing into fragments, and the binding of those fragments together by rolling weight over the surface, being thus conducted at the expense, not of the constructors of, but of the travellers over, the road.

By degrees Mr. Macadam so far satisfied his fellow-magistrates and road-trustees of the excellence of his plan, that the London road out of Bristol, as far as their authority extended, was repaired altogether under his direction. The success corresponded to the anticipation. Thus it chanced that one day the Postmaster-General, on looking over the winter programme for the timing of the mail, which differed materially from that arranged for the summer, saw that there was a stage for which no extra allowance was made. “How is this?” said his Lordship; “you have allowed no further time for the stage into Bristol.” “No, my Lord,” was the reply, “the mail always goes as fast over that stage in winter as in summer.” The Postmaster-General asked no further questions—none, at least, that elicited any

explanation of so anomalous a fact; but he ordered his carriage and made the best of his way to Bristol. Stopping at the post-house, which bounded the trust administered by Mr. Macadam, he walked over the ground, and then, without saying anything further, drove back again to town. Then he wrote for the amateur Commissioner to come up to him. 'I want you to take the superintendence of all the mail roads of the kingdom,' said the Postmaster-General. Mr. Macadam hesitated, and wrote to his sons, then making independent starts in life, to come to his assistance. The young men, who had generally their good-humoured jokes ready to pass on their father's hobby, now thought that the old gentleman was out of his senses. 'What! give up the actual business of life, and set to work at carrying out their father's road-making fancies all over England!' Reflection, however, and consultation, brought the younger men over to the views of the elder. The offer of the Postmaster-General was accepted, and when this account was given by Sir James, the income of that gentleman from the various trusts which paid him £50 per annum each, was about £10,000 a-year."

Some of the liveliest pages in the book are those in which present anonymous sketches of less notable persons variously connected with engineering work are given. Among these are graphic delineations of a resident whose main principle of business appeared to be the idea that any statement made to him was necessarily false;—a local surveyor, who contrived to cram three hours' sleep in his clothes and three days' work into twenty-four hours, and who, on one occasion, made a charge for seventeen or eighteen well-filled and well-earned days out of the twenty-one which a week was thus made to contain;—a chief under whom this industry was acquired, "too full of contradictions to be dismissed in a line," the nature of whose conscience was "so exclusively peculiar, that they who knew him best were unable to decide where it lay;"—a versatile, brilliant, wily "correspondent," whose "character, or, at all events, ecclesiastical relations were enigmatic," whose peculiar ability seemed to have been formed, or greatly aided, by a mode of study unknown in any Protestant college or establishment for education;—a ballast contractor bound by his specification to use "no bit of broken stone larger than a man could put in his mouth," and who drily selected the man of most capacious mouth (an "extremely ugly" fellow) to be found on the works, to accompany him as his "Ballast Gauge" during the engineer's visit of inspection—and an engineer who "took into Parliament more railway bills than almost any other," "lost them all but one," which was secured by the exertions of the experienced contractor who intended to make the line, and whose lamentable failures might be traced to "a useless and blind perfidy," illustrated thus:—"He professed to touch no work on Sunday. He did his duty by attending to what was indispensable; but he satisfied that species of ingenuity which took with him the place of conscience, by always dating such exceptional Sunday work on the preceding or the following day."

There is an unkindness of tone in this description, and elsewhere in the book which is not welcome; while, in a few instances, we could have wished that some immoralities had either been left unchronicled, or that they had been written of in language less jocose and more condemnatory. It must not be supposed, however, that the book contains nothing more substantial than gossip and anecdote. The chapters entitled "Disputes as to Payment for Works," "Government Inspection," "Railway Finance," "The Future of Engineering," &c., supply results of observation, experience, and work, which may be turned to good practical account. From much which tempts quotation, we extract the following testimony to the importance of a Sabbath to hard-working men:—

"Brunel, in the judgment of those who remember the iron energy of his youth, should now be a man in the prime of intellectual vigour. Robert Stephenson might naturally have looked forward to many years of quiet authority. Locke, Rendel, Moorsom,—how many are the names which a greater reticence of labour, and more attention to the laws of health, might have kept for many years from the obituary! In regarding such a mortality, it is difficult not to search for some cause peculiar to the profession. One sufficient cause may, perhaps, be detected in the habitual loss of the usual repose of the Sunday. For men to turn night into day is, in itself, a hard strain. Twelve days' work per week will try the strongest constitution; but make the twelve into fourteen, and the fatal result arrives with startling rapidity."

*Wrecked in Port.* A Novel. By Edmund Yates. Three Volumes. London: Chapman & Hall.

A NOVEL which obtains a certain success simply by reason of the abnormal demand, now of long standing, but happily beginning to wane, for what is generally known as sensational literature, may or may not be worth recording; but if it be, the chances are that such book is notable, not as a literary production, but as one of many symptoms serviceable to sociologists in diagnosing a social epidemic. When, however, a story based on homely foundation, built of materials other than ruptures of the Decalogue in general, and the sixth, seventh, and eighth sections thereof in particular, and decorated with something more open to inspection than gaudy pigment and varnish and stucco,—when such a story comes into circulation and notice, the position is obviously attained by some merit other than the fictitious one which has brought considerable profit to many persons of *minimum* literary merit and *maximum* mountebankism. A book that sustains our interest simply by concentrating attention on some of the ordinary relationships of contemporary life, evidently appeals to healthy instincts, and merits consideration as legitimate, not sensational, literature,—inasmuch as healthy instincts are only to be appealed to by healthy forces of whatever kind or degree. Such a book is *Wrecked in Port*, noteworthy first of all for its very able analysis of a certain phase of female character,

and, secondly, for the unromantic nature of a plot which is treated in a manner quite unsensational.

The conception of the heroine, Marian Ashurst, is that of a girl of excellent capacities, and with a fair share of tenderness (displayed principally towards her parents); she is eminently a girl of common sense; and the business element of her character has had from childhood a tendency to over-development, so that the chief danger in her bringing up is that she may become coldly mercenary. Unfortunately, her parents are blind to this danger; and, worse still, circumstances so turn as to exaggerate in her mind the value of wealth, so that she gradually grows to an overmastering conviction that wealth is the one thing worth striving for. Under this conviction her reason sanctions to her heart an attachment which springs up between her and a young man, Walter Joyce, whose abilities she thinks sufficient to raise him in the world to the level of her ambition; but, seeing disappointment in this respect imminent, she seizes an unfortunate opportunity of marrying a rich elderly man, Squire Creswell, jilting her lover coldly enough, though not without a struggle.

Thus far the book, which first appeared in *All the Year Round*, is written with great care as to the weighing of all the materials used; and the result is that the portrait of Marian Ashurst is thoroughly coherent in its psychology, and pleasing even in the face of its disagreeable traits, while the minor characters are not "brought on" enough to involve the author in any serious difficulties. The canvas, as long as it is occupied chiefly by the girl with a turn for business, is covered with excellent artistic work; but as the other characters increase in prominence, the week-by-week system tells upon the texture, and we see traces of pressure for "copy" when the artist was not thoroughly prepared with it. The conception of Walter Joyce, as a youth, somewhat romantically disposed, but brought to his senses by disappointment in his *promessa sposa*, and passing through stages of hard work to a brilliant, but eminently common-place *littérateur* and M.P., is a good conception; so is that of Squire Creswell's nieces, who lose the good home they have long enjoyed under their uncle's roof, and who, from a state of rather stupid young ladyhood, grow, by stress of circumstances, to a moderate self-sufficiency and an interesting intelligence; good also is the idea of Mr. Benthall, the selfish, calculating parson, who under the ennobling influence of love for one of these girls develops a more than average faculty for facing the fact that other people exist besides oneself. All these are excellent conceptions, and the author never seems to have been at a loss to know how to work them out; but a discerning reader can see from many touches in the early part of the work that these personages were originally intended to be carried out differently. Such touches must have disappeared, under revision, from a work not printed as it came in instalments from the author's brain to the editor's office; and slight inaccuracies of style or inelegancies of diction would equally have been removed if the chapters had not had to be produced "against time."

The writer, being pledged by his title to wreck Marian Ashurst in port, leaves her on the stage as Widow Crestwell, rich and miserable, and so far fulfils himself; but the elements of her misery are not selected and combined with the same niceness of sight and firmness of hand shown in selecting and combining the primary elements of her character. These faults, however, are not glaring,—so little so that, to the “general reader” of novels, *Wrecked in Port* must have the air of a very well finished work. It is because the book appeals to other appetites besides that of the omnivorous personage referred to that these blemishes are worth noticing,—because the central thought is admirable, the moral tone unimpeachable, and the draughtsmanship in regard to the heroine in her girlhood at once broad and true, that one cannot but wish Mr. Yates had been as happy in the circumstances of production as in those of conception.

**The Church Seasons, Historically and Poetically Illustrated.**

By Alexander H. Grant, M.A., Author of “Half-Hours with our Sacred Poets.” London: James Hogg and Son, York Street, Covent Garden.

THIS work will be chiefly interesting to members of the Church of England, although all English Christians, however much they may object to parts of the *Book of Common Prayer*, cannot but feel an interest in a book which, for three centuries, has inspired much of their religious phraseology.

Mr. Grant follows and dwells on the chief Christian seasons, without furnishing particular illustrations of the services for every Sunday in the year. This is true of the larger portion of the work, which illustrates by hymns, and, in other ways, the cardinal points of doctrine as they radiate from the Person of Christ. And here we can follow him with profit.

The latter half of the work treats of the services commemorative of the Apostles, &c., or the Holy Days, and will be chiefly interesting as illustrative of early Church history.

“The selection of illustrative poetry has been made from a field as wide as the aggregate contributions of the Christian Muse, irrespective of age, nationality, or ecclesiastical order,” to the whole or large part of which but few can have access. For Christmas Day we should like to have seen Milton’s celebrated hymn on the Nativity: *This is the day, and this the happy morn!*

The following short but startling “Carol of the Kings” is described by its author, the Rev. R. S. Hawker, as “An Armenian Myth.” We give it entire:—

“Three ancient men in Bethlehem’s cave  
With awful wonder stand;  
A voice that called them from their grave  
In some far Eastern land.

“They lived, they trod the former earth  
When the old waters swelled;  
The Ark, that womb of second birth,  
Their house and lineage held.



"Pale Japhet bows the knee with gold,  
Bright Sem sweet incense brings,  
And Cham, the myrrh his fingers hold—  
Lo, the three Orient kings !

"Types of the total earth, they hailed  
The signal's starry frame ;  
Shuddering with second life, they quailed  
At the Child Jesu's Name.

"Then slow the Patriarchs turned and trod ;  
And this their parting sigh,—  
Our eyes have seen the Living God ;  
And now—once more to die."

While we cannot commend Mr. Grant's compilation as of the highest order, we doubt not but that it will be welcomed by those for whom it is intended.

Virgil. By the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A., Author of "Etoniana," "The Public Schools," &c. Edinburgh and London : William Blackwood and Sons.

THIS is the fifth volume of the series of *Ancient Classics for English Readers*, edited by the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A., which we introduced in July. It was, we are told in an advertisement, "to have been undertaken by the late Mr. Conington." We agree with Mr. Collins in deploring that death should have snatched the congenial task from the hands of this accomplished scholar, and we may be allowed to picture to ourselves the work as it would have been performed by him ; but at the same time we are bound to say that his substitute has admirably succeeded in bringing "Virgil" nearer to us. His method of treatment is vivid, and, in a graphic and picturesque style, he exhibits the fulness of a classical scholar. The introduction, the notice of the poet, the analysis of "The Pastorals," "The Georgics," and "The Æneid," as well as the "concluding remarks," are worthy of the great original.

Mr. Collins makes most of his quotations from Mr. Conington's "admirable version of the Æneid ;" and in one sense his book may be regarded as an elaborate and loving review of that performance. To this we may return hereafter ; meanwhile, from the specimen we give, our readers will judge that "the metre of Scott" does not reproduce the "terseness and pathos" of the original lines—

"Facilis descensus Averni ;  
Noctes atque Dies patet atra janua Ditis ;  
Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,  
Hoc opus, hic labor est."

"The journey down to the Abyss  
Is prosperous and light ;  
The palace-gates of gloomy Dis  
Stand open day and night.  
But upward to retrace the way,  
And pass into the light of day,—  
There comes the stress of labour—this  
May task a hero's might."

This stanza is graceful and pleasing; but, as a translation, it is to the original what "the metre of Scott" is to the sonorous hexameter, or what the "Lady of the Lake" is to the *Æneid*.

The admiring line of Propertius applies to all translators:—

"Cedite, Romani scriptores! cedite Graii!"

for no version *can* adequately represent the original.

We do not quite agree with Mr. Collins' estimate in his last chapter of what an epic poem should be. It might almost seem that he postulates for his epic a love-romance, running with silver thread through the whole poem, and a hero, dominant from first to last, and taller by head and shoulder than his fellows: whereas, an epic is neither a novel nor a tragic drama, but a lofty chronicle of events of secular importance. We love, too, to think better of "Pius Æneas" than does Mr. Collins.

In the matter of his desertion of Dido, we hold that "better late than never," and love to side rather with Delille than with our author. As to Æneas' frequent tears and sighs and heavenward-extended palms, individuals and peoples are variously constituted. However much most of us may object, as in certain contemporary despatches from the seat of war, to the continuous effusion of pious sentiment, yet where there is sincerity and the sentiment expressed is real, we can only say that constitutions differ, and that *we* should be more reserved. It is questionable humour that says: "He spreads his palms out to heaven in the most orthodox fashion on all occasions." Which is the orthodox fashion? For ourselves, believing in a Higher Power, we gladly see our hero—

"Tendens ad sidera palmas."

Under adversity, as after the shipwreck, Æneas shows himself a true leader of men. When we read his address, "O, socii," and learn that—

"Curis ingentibus æger  
Spem vultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem,"

we think that he rose to the occasion more heroically than some of the leaders in the Franco-Prussian War.

For the rest, we can do nought but commend this book to "English readers" and classical readers alike. The former will find it a volume interesting by the fireside, or in the train, and will be prompted to read "Virgil" for themselves: the latter will gladly retrace their steps through old scenes, happy to have features of the landscape indicated which they had ignored, or to find long-cherished predilections challenged by a congenial critic.

The Wesleyan Methodist Atlas. Section I. By the Rev. E. H. Tindall.

THIS undertaking, already introduced to our readers, is making good progress in the hands of its bold and skilful projector. As a series of

sectional maps of England, it has no competitor, so far as we know; in fact, its beauty and convenience could not be surpassed. But it is to the Methodists, and to those whose broad sympathies, or whose ecclesiastical inquiries, make the progress of Methodism matter of interest, that this Atlas will be most valuable.

About nineteen counties are represented in the First Section, in which there are nearly four thousand places marked. These, with a few exceptions, represent places having more than 250 inhabitants. Of these, nearly 1,800 have Methodist preaching, whilst some 2,200 are unvisited. In addition to these, the parishes and villages possessing less than 250 inhabitants, and consequently not marked on these maps, number more than 1,600, but in many of these places the population consist only of a few families, widely scattered over extensive areas of country. There are only some 12 parishes in the East Riding where Methodism has no footing. The proportion of preaching-stations in Lincolnshire to places unfrequented by their agency is in the ratio of *nine to one*. In Plate VIII. five out of every eight places marked are preaching-places, but, crowded as this map seems with the coloured spots representing chapels, there are some 300 places, or more, beyond our present reach. In Suffolk and Essex the lowest proportion is found; only one out of every five places marked have Methodist service. In Norfolk the ratio is as one in every three; Hertford, Kent, and Surrey, showing a similar state of things. Sussex has only one in four.

The reflections to which a study of this Atlas gives rise this is not the place to dwell upon. But such statistics as these speak for themselves. This ingenious and most useful work ought to be largely patronised; we believe that it will have a current usefulness for a long time; and when Methodism has outgrown the Atlas, it will still have a deep historical interest.

**The Christ of the Gospels.** By the Rev. H. J. Martyn.  
London: E. Stock, 62, Paternoster-row. 1870.

THE Incarnation, the Miracles, the Teachings, and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ are the four topics of so many chapters forming this little book. Orthodox views of these themes are maintained to be the true ones, and are upheld against the objections of doubt and criticism. Into sixty-five readable pages, in a clear, compact, and forcible style, the writer has compressed much instructive thought and helpful argument. Within so small a compass it would be absurd to expect exhaustive treatment; but we could wish that the book had been enlarged by the addition of a chapter upon the "Death of Christ." Surely some mention of that central event, leading to some discussion of its import, is essential to any sketch of "the Christ of the Gospels." In the analysis of "the Teachings of Jesus" this lack is not compensated for as it might have been, to some extent, by a paragraph showing what He taught respecting the condition and wants of men as sinners, and His own work as their Redeemer. Perhaps, however, this defect was in

the author's mind when, in his preface, he wrote of his little volume as only "part of a cherished design, and that part much too incomplete to satisfy" him. So far as its contents go, we recommend the book; it is ably written, and can scarcely fail to be serviceable to many.

**Memoir of the Rev. Michael C. Taylor, with Extracts from his Correspondence.** By Benjamin Hellier. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1870.

A BEAUTIFUL, fraternal tribute to a pure-minded, hard-working, humble man; the greatness of whose life was found rather in the sentiments of his heart than in the incidents of his history. It is an etching, light, delicate, and not overdrawn; or it is a model in low relief as became alike the subject and his biographer. It reflects great credit upon the writer from the delicacy with which his subject is portrayed, as well as from the meekness with which himself is hidden. Yet we could have wished to see more of his hand. There is a philosophy of life the biographer alone can supply. The steel engraving at the beginning, and the graceful, discriminating letter at the end, help to make up a memorial we shall gratefully cherish, and which we earnestly recommend to our readers.

**Dark Sayings on a Harp; and other Sermons on some of the Dark Questions of Human Life.** Preached in Queen Square Chapel, Brighton. By the Rev. Paxton Hood. Second Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

FRESH and bold in conception, free, firm, and rigorous in the handling, these sermons penetrate to the depth of the dark things of human life, and throw some bright gleams of spiritual teaching and Christian faith upon them.

**Hymns and Meditations.** By A. L. W. Eleventh Edition. Enlarged. Strahan & Co. 1870.

*Eleventh Edition*, on the title-page, shows that these *Hymns and Meditations* have taken their place as favourite refreshment for weary hearts. We do not wonder that it should be so. Despite an occasional harshness of rhythm, there is a terseness, a tenderness, a self-restraint, a truthfulness, about them which commend them to earnest, longing, patient souls.